



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>



32.

142.



66T

1. The first part of the book is devoted to a general survey of the history of the world from the beginning of time to the present day.

2. The second part of the book is devoted to a detailed account of the history of the world from the beginning of time to the present day.

3. The third part of the book is devoted to a detailed account of the history of the world from the beginning of time to the present day.

4. The fourth part of the book is devoted to a detailed account of the history of the world from the beginning of time to the present day.

5. The fifth part of the book is devoted to a detailed account of the history of the world from the beginning of time to the present day.

6. The sixth part of the book is devoted to a detailed account of the history of the world from the beginning of time to the present day.

7. The seventh part of the book is devoted to a detailed account of the history of the world from the beginning of time to the present day.

8. The eighth part of the book is devoted to a detailed account of the history of the world from the beginning of time to the present day.

9. The ninth part of the book is devoted to a detailed account of the history of the world from the beginning of time to the present day.

10. The tenth part of the book is devoted to a detailed account of the history of the world from the beginning of time to the present day.

11. The eleventh part of the book is devoted to a detailed account of the history of the world from the beginning of time to the present day.

12. The twelfth part of the book is devoted to a detailed account of the history of the world from the beginning of time to the present day.

13. The thirteenth part of the book is devoted to a detailed account of the history of the world from the beginning of time to the present day.

14. The fourteenth part of the book is devoted to a detailed account of the history of the world from the beginning of time to the present day.

15. The fifteenth part of the book is devoted to a detailed account of the history of the world from the beginning of time to the present day.

3



32.

142.



600006566T

✓
ANALYSIS
OF THE
SEVEN PARTS OF SPEECH
OF THE
ENGLISH LANGUAGE,

WITH A VIEW TO FIX THEIR CHARACTER, AND FURNISH
SIMPLE RULES FOR ASCERTAINING THEM; AS ALSO
TO ELUCIDATE AND FACILITATE THE METHOD
OF PARSING.

Chiefly on a New Principle.

WITH

AN APPENDIX.



BY THE

REV. CHARLES J. LYON, M. A.,

LATE OF TRINITY COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE.

“ Though Grammar be usually amongst the first things taught, it is
always one of the last understood.”—DIVERSIONS OF PURLEY.

“ Le plus grand avantage d'une langue est d'être clair. Tous les pro-
cédés de grammaire ne devoient aller qu'à ce but.”

M. LE PRESIDENT DE BROSSES.

EDINBURGH :

PRINTED FOR OLIVER & BOYD, TWEEDDALE-COURT ;
AND SIMPKIN & MARSHALL, LONDON.

1832.

142.

Oliver & Boyd, Printers.

CONTENTS.

| | Page |
|---------------------------|------|
| INTRODUCTION,..... | 1 |
| NOUN,..... | 17 |
| ADJECTIVE,..... | 20 |
| PRONOUN,..... | 31 |
| VERB,..... | 34 |
| PREPOSITION,..... | 55 |
| CONJUNCTION,..... | 59 |
| ADVERB,..... | 66 |
| CONCLUSION,..... | 70 |
| SPECIMEN OF PARSING,..... | 71 |

APPENDIX.

- A. The present unsettled state of the English Parts
of Speech,..... 85
- B. The same word is not more than one Part of Speech.
—In this Appendix it is shown that the word **THAT**
is always a Definite Adjective, having a noun ex-
pressed or understood after it,..... 93

| | Page |
|--|------|
| C. Our Auxiliary Verbs are essential parts of our Regular Verbs, | 108 |
| D. English Nouns have no Gender,..... | 111 |
| E. On the etymology and use of the words THEN and THAN , which are shown to be the same word.—In this Appendix is explained the etymological signification of the comparative degree in English, French, and Latin,..... | 113 |
| F. On the twofold use of the word THERE ,..... | 119 |
| G. On the etymology and use of the pronoun IT ,..... | 121 |
| H. Professor Dugald Stewart and the Quarterly Review, <i>versus</i> Horne Tooke's Divisions of Purley, | 125 |

INTRODUCTION.

EVERY one may have observed how few persons, even of the best education, can take up an English book, and give accurately the parts of speech of the words, in the order they occur. Nor is this much to be wondered at, when we look into the present state of English Grammar, as exhibited in all the popular books on the subject. They are enough to puzzle philosophers themselves, and more than enough to bewilder and disgust the unfortunate children who are doomed to wade through them.

The only grammar I have met with which has any pretensions to simplicity, is one by the famous Cobbett, who writes expressly (as he tells us) for “sailors and soldiers, plough-boys and apprentices.” The work is certainly entitled to notice, on account of the extraordinary circulation it has

A

had among the educated classes of society: but as to intrinsic merit, it seems to me to leave the subject it professes to simplify just as much clogged and disfigured as it was before; nor, in fact, is it very easy to discover in what respects it differs from other grammars, excepting that it repeats their errors in plainer language, and in so doing, only tends to give them greater currency and perpetuity.* Had the author, however, exercised his usual penetration, he might have seen that, since even statesmen and philosophers have, upon his own showing, fallen into grammatical errors (though they have not fallen into quite so many as he alleges), his soldiers, sailors, and plough-boys, could have very little hope of avoiding them. I will venture to assert, that none of these persons ever read, or ever will read Cob-

* There is indeed another object in the publication of this book (whether the principal, or only a secondary one, I pretend not to decide), namely, the propagation of treason and libel, and a wanton abuse of the constituted authorities of the country. Cobbett may thank his stars that he is an Englishman; for such a publication would not be tolerated in any other country under the sun; not even in America.

As to his grammatical errors, I shall have occasion to advert to a few of them in the Notes and Appendix to this Analysis.

bett's grammar ; nor, if they did, could they comprehend a twentieth part of it. Not that the subject is difficult, or that his manner of treating it is unintelligible ; but his work (partly from its very nature, but chiefly from the defects it possesses in common with all other grammars) is not, with all its pretensions to simplicity, adapted for the lower orders of society ; who, indeed, as it seems to me, have nothing to do with the niceties of grammar, or with any other niceties beyond those of their respective occupations.

I have not myself the vanity to think that my *Analysis* will be read by the lower orders, though I have rendered it as simple as possible, and have excluded from it all hard names and technical terms, to which I have as great an objection as they can have. Such terms, in a grammatical disquisition especially, seem to me not only useless, but pernicious, for whatever class of readers it may be intended—useless, because the subject may just as well be explained without them—and pernicious, because they tend to render that mysterious and unintelligible, which in reality is just the reverse.

My object has been to correct certain errors, which, with all deference, I conceive our grammar-

rians have fallen into. I have endeavoured also to supply their omissions, and to do away with their redundancies ; and, in general, to simplify the rules for *Parsing*, by furnishing clear explanations of the Parts of Speech : and though I have not attempted to define metaphysically their nature, I have done what perhaps may be thought more important, furnished easy rules for their use. I have, besides, given the exact number of the Pronouns, Prepositions, and Conjunctions, which has never been done before ; so that, if my rules be approved, these parts of speech may be considered as rescued from that perplexing uncertainty in which they have hitherto been involved. I have, moreover, given a new arrangement of the Verb ; and have abolished the useless distinction of the Article, by throwing it into the Adjective, to which it naturally belongs. I have, however, retained the old names of the parts of speech, notwithstanding that several of them are objectionable—contenting myself with suggesting what I consider to be better ones in the Notes. In short, I have made no alteration of any kind but what the necessity of the case seemed to require ; and whatever change I have proposed, has been solely with a view to substitute something short and

simple, for what before was complicated, inaccurate, or unintelligible.*

Let it not be supposed, at the same time, that I affect to have made any discoveries. Much of what I have advanced is, I believe, new : at least, it is the result of my own reflection, and different from any thing I have met with in English Grammars. The truth is, that I found I entertained very confused ideas of the Parts of Speech ; and moreover, that this confusion was shared by others whom I consulted, and who might be supposed to know better. I therefore set about clearing away the rubbish, merely to fill up my leisure hours agreeably, and, as I thought, not uselessly : and having, after a good deal of labour, succeeded, to my own satisfaction at least, I felt anxious to make the path which I had cleared for myself, equally accessible to others.

It is not, however, difficult either to detect existing errors, or to suggest a remedy for them. The difficulty is to *simplify* the remedy ; and not only to make its usefulness obvious, but its application easy. I have spent much time and reflection in endeavouring to accomplish this object in respect

* See Appendix A.

to English Grammar ; with what success, it is not for me to decide.

I cannot here avoid expressing my surprise how little attention has been paid to this department of Literature by the writers of our age ; and how little taste the generality of persons appear to have for the subject. In the too eager pursuit of other matters, we do not pay sufficient attention to that by which alone they are all treated and handled. I hesitate not to assert, that we have no English Grammar, nor any work upon the subject, that can give the Englishman clear notions of the Parts of Speech of his language : we have nothing, in fact, but a few clumsy and almost unintelligible compilations “ for the use of schools ;” or disquisitions that are far too philosophical and abstruse for the unlearned reader.* While there

* “ It is a curious example of the spirit of the age, that Mr Lindley Murray’s Grammar has proceeded to the thirtieth edition, in complete defiance of all the facts and arguments laid down in Tooke’s *Diversions of Purley*. Murray translates the Latin Grammar into English, as so many had done before him, and fancies he has written an English Grammar ! and divines applaud, and schoolmasters usher him into the polite world, and English scholars carry on the jest, while Horne Tooke’s genuine anatomy of our native tongue is laid on the shelf ! Can it be that our politicians smell a rat in the member for Old Sarum ? that our clergy do not relish Parson Horne ? that the world at large are alarmed at acuteness and originality

has been a competition for superiority in almost every other branch of knowledge, this, which is so intimately connected with them all, has been unaccountably neglected. Even of our learned men, the great majority, I suspect, understand Greek and Latin better than they do English.* It is true that English cannot be fully understood without a knowledge of other languages: but surely, in respect to minute grammatical investigation, we ought not to give any tongue a preference to our own: nor indeed is it possible to translate, with accuracy, any foreign language into English, without a thorough comprehension of the *minutiae* of both. At any rate, we cannot employ our knowledge of the languages of Europe (whether

greater than their own?—It seems in this, as in many other instances, as if there were a patent for absurdity in the natural bias of the human mind, and that folly should be stereotyped.”—*Old Number of the New Monthly Magazine*.

* “It is an egregious but common error to imagine that a perfect knowledge of Greek and Latin precludes the necessity of studying the principles of English Grammar. The structure of the ancient, and that of the modern languages are very dissimilar.”—CROMBIE.

It is a curious fact that, in the notes to Soame’s Bampton Lectures for 1830, on the Doctrines of the Anglo-Saxon Church, the Latin and Greek quotations are not translated into English, while the Anglo-Saxon uniformly are. Does not this prove that our learned men know Greek and Latin better than their own language?

they be dead or living) better than in enabling us to master the etymology and use of our own. Persons of any pretensions to education should at least endeavour clearly to understand the parts of speech of a language which is daily in their mouths ; and not be contented with barely looking at the superficies, when, with a very little trouble, they may penetrate to a considerable depth beyond the surface. They will discover many beautiful and valuable gems to reward them for their labour.

I have met, indeed, with well-informed persons, clergymen, and even authors of merit, who have contended that the study of English Grammar is unnecessary, on the plea that we learn from mixing with good society, and from the perusal of standard books, both to speak and write our native tongue with propriety. It is painful to be under the necessity of refuting a notion so obviously erroneous, and pregnant with mischief. I would only ask such persons the few following questions :— Will not the English language gradually degenerate, and cease in time to be a civilized language at all, if the principles of it are neglected by the very persons whose compositions are justly regarded as the standards of its purity ? When, in speak-

ing and writing, we only follow the multitude, may we not be said to be groping in the dark, and proceeding more from chance than from intelligence? And shall we not, in that case, be continually liable to fall into errors, without having in our possession any test by which to correct them? Is not the writer who knows his native tongue grammatically, more likely than one who does not, to avoid those ambiguous and inaccurate sentences which disfigure the compositions of our most popular authors? It is granted that custom is the sole rule for the *pronunciation* of words; but are we not to be guided by something higher, in determining the laws of Universal Grammar? Besides, does not our conceiving a subject clearly, and thinking upon it correctly, depend much upon learning to express ourselves upon it with precision? Finally, if it be necessary to attend to the *minutiæ* of other languages, in order to a full understanding of them, how can we be said to understand English, if we know no more about *its* minutiæ than what may be gathered from capricious custom,—no more, in short, than what the simplest child or the most illiterate peasant has picked up, thoughtlessly and at random, from the mere hearsay of his companions?

But to return. I have taken the liberty to find

great fault with my predecessors, for which I suppose I shall be found great fault with myself: if, indeed, I be so far honoured as to be noticed at all. Should, however, my cotemporaries censure me with as much apparent *reason* as I have censured others, I shall be thankful for the reproof, and study to profit by it. If I get advice which is really valuable, I will excuse the harsh terms in which it may chance to be conveyed.

At the same time, I think it necessary to say that the manner in which the public may receive this Analysis will be to me no proof either of its merit or demerit. When I observe such performances as those of L. Murray and Cobbett universally applauded, I am forced to conclude that it is much easier to obtain praise than to deserve it. On the other hand, the little esteem in which the Divisions of Purley is held is an instance that the highest praise may be deserved, and not received.* I am not, therefore, so sanguine as to expect a place among the enviable few who have both *deserved* the public approbation and *obtained* it. Meanwhile, however, I am satisfied as to the im-

* Some French writer says, "La faveur prodiguée aux mauvais ouvrages, est aussi contraire aux progrès de l'esprit que le déchaînement contre les bons."

portance and utility of what I have attempted, notwithstanding some imperfections with which it may possibly be incumbered.

On what is commonly called *Syntax* I have said little, because, from the title of the work, this was evidently foreign to my purpose. Besides, however defective our popular grammars are on the Parts of Speech, they are by no means so on Syntax; nor am I aware that any material improvement could be made in that department. At the same time, I am persuaded that a clear knowledge of the Parts of Speech, and intercourse with persons of good education, would, in a great measure, supersede the necessity of perusing works on Syntax.

I ought here to state that this Analysis is not intended for mere beginners, because I have supposed my readers to be already acquainted with the outlines of English Grammar: in other words, to know what every person of the least pretensions to education must know; and hence I have not repeated what may be found in every abridgment of every grammar that is in print. Still less have I entered into those details which Harris, Murray, Grant, and others have so industriously pursued,—details, one-half of which, as it seems to me, every

Englishman knows already, without having read them; and the other half, very few persons would be the wiser for, were they to pore over them ever so studiously. My main object has been to elucidate and facilitate the method of parsing: and by keeping this object steadily in view, I hope it will be found that I have equally avoided the obscurity arising from brevity, and the tediousness proceeding from redundancy.

It will be seen that I have availed myself of some valuable hints suggested by the learned author of the *Diversions of Purley*. The object of that inestimable work, however, is chiefly to expose the errors of the ancient and modern grammarians, which is done with an acuteness and research beyond all praise; but it must ever be regretted that one so admirably fitted for the task as Tooke was, should not have advanced a step farther than he did, and constructed a grammar and dictionary on the principles he so successfully advocated. This is the more to be regretted, since nothing is so bewildering and irksome to the English student, as to find (which we continually do in Johnson's Dictionary) the same word put down as *two*, *three*, or *four* different parts of speech; and each of these with from five to fifty different meanings! when we know that this same

word may be proved to be only *one* part of speech ; and, however modified by the connexion in which it is used, to have but *one* primary meaning. The Diversions of Purley may satisfy every one that words have only one meaning ; and I have taken upon myself to show that they are not more than one part of speech.*

It seems impossible to compose even a tolerable dictionary or grammar, or work on synonymes, without some knowledge of Etymology,—which term I do not use in the sense commonly affixed to it in our popular grammars, in order to distinguish it from Syntax : but I mean by it, the origin and derivation of words as far back as we can trace them, together with their various collateral significations, whether literal or figurative. Nothing but this will furnish the clue to the true meaning of particular words. *Without* the clue, we grope in the dark, and lose ourselves in a labyrinth of errors : *with* the clue, the path is easily discovered, time is saved, and confusion avoided.

I by no means assert that it is necessary for all who *use* dictionaries to be etymologists : but it is evident that when a lexicographer does not himself

* See Appendix B.

know the true signification of a word, he cannot give a satisfactory explanation of it to others. His ignorance will betray itself even to the unlearned. The most superficial may perceive when an author is master of his subject, or when he is only hazarding random assertions, or improbable guesses concerning it. All I mean to affirm is, that words and synonymes ought to be invariably *based* on Etymology, which is the only anchor that can keep them stationary amid the storms and currents to which the ocean of language is ever subject.*

* How, for example, can the seemingly different senses of the same words in English and French, be understood, without knowing their Etymology? Such as, attend and *attendre*; defend and *defendre*; particular and *particulier*; assist and *assister*, and a hundred others. Or how can the various meanings of the same word in English be satisfactorily explained, without keeping in view its derivation? To instance the word *fare*: *faran* is the Anglo-Saxon verb *to go*; hence we have *far*, *gone*; what is your *fare*? or, what is your *going*? no thorough-fare, or, no thorough (through) *going*; a way-faring and sea-faring man, or, a way-going or sea-going man; how *fares* it with you? or, how *goes* it with you? or, how do you *get on* generally? *farewell*, or, *go, get on well*: and hence, by an easy transition, the noun *fare* means the general *getting on*, in respect to treatment, accommodations, provisions, &c. Let any one now turn to Johnson's Dictionary, and compare this simple *Etymological* account of the word *fare*, with his, and decide which is the most satisfactory.

In the Notes and Appendix of this Treatise, I have availed myself of Etymology whenever it throws light on the Parts of Speech, or on points that are confessedly ob-

The utmost this Analysis professes to effect is, to supply what the generality of persons, I have reason to believe, feel the want of,—namely, *distinct conceptions on the Seven Parts of Speech of the English Language*,—a subject which, more than any other, has been rendered unintelligible by the obscurity of definitions, and the technicalities of terms : and though in its present state the Analysis may not be altogether adapted for beginners, yet it will be very easy to construct an abridged grammar for their use, on the plan I have recommended, should it be approved of.

All that is necessary for the ordinary reader, is contained in the text of the Analysis, which is short. Those who wish to go beyond the surface may, it is hoped, derive satisfaction from the Notes and Appendix, in which some original matter will be found.

A specimen of Parsing is given at the conclusion, where a letter of Lord Chesterfield's to his Son, is employed for the purpose of illustrating the rules contained in the Analysis.

scure, but not to the subversion of any of the established principles of the language.

ANALYSIS

OF THE

SEVEN PARTS OF SPEECH, &c.

Noun.

I HAVE remarked in the preface, that I do not profess to give definitions of the Parts of Speech, but only rules for their use. I am obliged, however, to find a definition for the Noun, as otherwise we should have no *datum* to proceed upon in determining the remaining parts of speech. The Adjective and Pronoun (it will be seen) may be known from the Noun; the Verb and Preposition from the Pronoun; the Conjunction from the Verb; and the Adverb from them all; but we have no similar method of determining the Noun; and

hence the necessity of considering it as a sort of axiom or first principle, and giving it an independent definition. I would therefore define the NOUN (from *nom*, *nomen*) to be the *name* of any person, place, thing, quality, or principle,—using these words in their most extensive signification, or more briefly, THE NAME OF WHATEVER MAY BE THE SUBJECT OF CONVERSATION.*

There has been great diversity of opinion as to the number of the *cases* of our Nouns,—some arguing for six, some for three, some for two, and others for one ; while one grammarian of the 17th century (Dr Wallis) contends that our noun should be divested of cases altogether ; and that what is commonly called the possessive *case*, ought to be considered as a possessive *adjective*, on the ground that it goes before, and in some sort qualifies, a noun. On this point, I have adopted the opinion of the two most distinguished grammarians of the last century, viz. Bishop Lowth and Dr Priestly,—not altogether because the opinion is theirs, but because it is most consonant to the name

* I am indebted, for this definition, to Quintilian, who says of the Noun that it is *de quo loquimur* ; in contradistinction to the verb, which, he says, is *quod loquimur*.

and nature of the thing,—the word *case* signifying *cadence*, (from *casus*, *cado*) a fall, or termination : and hence we have just as many cases, as we have distinguishing terminations to our nouns ; and these, it is sufficiently obvious, are *two* only, viz. the nominative and possessive ; as, man, man's ; sun, sun's.

I say nothing of the *plurals* of nouns, because there is no uncertainty about them, and I suppose my readers to be already acquainted with them. As to gender, I do not admit that our nouns have any.*

I shall have occasion to make a few more observations on the noun, when treating of the Adjective ; for these two parts of speech, like man and wife, ought not, strictly speaking, to be “ put asunder.”

* See Appendix D.

Adjective.

THE office of the Adjective is to *designate* the Noun, or point out some peculiarity belonging to it ; and its position generally is, and always may be, immediately *before* the Noun.

The rule, then, I would offer for the ADJECTIVE is, that it PRECEDES AND DESIGNATES THE NOUN.*

With respect to the ordinary class of adjectives, it will not be necessary for me to do more than show that the above rule is strictly applicable to them. Thus we say, a *generous* man, a *large* house, a *sweet* orange ; and again, we designate a man as being generous, a house as being large, an orange as being sweet. Consequently, generous, large, and sweet, since they both precede and designate nouns, are adjectives. These, for the sake of distinction, may be called *Attributive Adjectives*, as generally indicating the *attribute* or qua-

* Possessive cases of nouns, verbs, and prepositions, precede nouns, but do not designate them.

The term *adjective* is evidently objectionable, since it has no reference to the use or character of the word : *Prenoun* would be better.

lity of the noun. And it may be added, that this is the only description of adjectives which admits of degrees of comparison ; as, generous, more generous, most generous ; large, larger, largest ; sweet, sweeter, sweetest.

There is a second class of words to which our rule of preceding and designating nouns will apply, and which, on this account, must be brought under the head of adjectives ; I mean *Pronominal Adjectives*, so called, because formed from their respective pronouns. Of these, there are exactly eleven ; *my, mine, thy, thine, his, her, its, our, your, their, whose*. We say, his book, her child, my table ; and the book is designated as being *his* book, the child, as being *her* child, and the table, as being *my* table. These consequently are adjectives.

When, in parsing, we meet with the words myself, thy-self, our-selves, &c., we can only say concerning them, that they are *compounded pronominal adjectives*, being compounds of the pronominal adjectives *my, thy, our, &c.*, and the affix *self*, or its plural, *selves*.*

* The term *self* is no part of speech : it is a mere affix, in the same manner that *un, dis, re, mis, sub*, and *con* are *prefixes*. Sometimes *self* is a prefix, as in self-denial.

There is a third description of words which equally admit of being put before nouns, and are equally employed to designate them. The following list contains a certain number of them :—*One, two, three, &c.*, ad infinitum ; *first, second, third, &c.*, ad infinitum ; *the,* this, that, which, what, these, those, only, own, same, each, every, another, both, whole, all, no.* These may be said to *define*, or restrict the sense of the noun to which they are joined, and may, for that reason, be called *Definite Adjectives*. The remainder of the words in question are as follows, and may, for the contrary reason, be called *Indefinite Adjectives* ; *a or an,**

* The reader may perhaps be surprised to find what are commonly called the Articles *the*, and *a or an*, classed among adjectives. But surely if these two words can be legitimately brought under this head, it must be wrong, in every view, to assign them a place by themselves. Now, it is evident that in the phrases *the house, a man, the* and *a* designate as well as precede their nouns ; for *a or an* is *one*, *one* (*unus*) ; so that *a man* is equivalent to *one, some, or any man* ; and, in like manner, *the house* is equivalent to *this, that, or the same house*. Hence *the* and *a* are definite and indefinite adjectives respectively.

Dr Wallis (one of our oldest and best grammarians) holds this opinion ; and Dr Priestly, in his *Rudiments of English Grammar*, says expressly, “ articles are, strictly speaking, adjectives, as they necessarily require a noun substantive to follow them, the signification of which they serve to limit and ascertain, as all adjectives do.”—P. 105.

The word *the* has been ascertained by Tooke to have the same etymology as the word *that*, the former being the im-

*whichever, whatever, any, some, other, few, several, many, such.**

It will be seen at once that all these words may be placed before nouns ; and they also serve to designate them. Thus, when we speak of *two* men, *that* house, *which* tree, *these* books, *some* children, *few* cities, *such* horses, &c., we designate these nouns by pointing out a peculiarity in each of them : of the *men*, it is intimated that it is not an unlimited number, but only two ; of the *tree* and *house*, that it is not any, but a particular one ; of the *books*, that it is certain books pointed to by the speaker ; of the *children* and *cities*, that it is a small number of them, in contradistinction to all or none ; of the *horses*, that it is a description similar to certain others that have been mentioned.†

perative of the Anglo-Saxon verb *thean*, to assume or suppose, and the latter the past participle (*thæd*, *thæt*, *that*) of the same verb. Hence *the* signified originally, *assume* ; and *that*, *assumed*. In Appendixes B and E we shall have occasion to make an important use of this etymology.

* My reason for excluding *either* and *neither* from the above list, will appear in Appendix B.

† There are a few anomalies or peculiarities in these definite and indefinite adjectives, which may require to be adverted to. Some of them are joined to nouns plural, some to nouns singular, and some to both. *Other*, and the numerals *one*, *two*, *three*, &c., admit of plural terminations ; as, *others*, *ones*, *twos*, *threes*, &c. We also write *other's*, *one's*, which are contractions for *other person's*,

There is a circumstance connected with these definite and indefinite adjectives which ought to be noticed here. According to Samuel Johnson and other lexicographers, they are not only one part of speech each, but two, three, and sometimes four, according to their apparently different use in different sentences. This, I am persuaded, is altogether an error, and a very mischievous one, inasmuch as it leads to great confusion. The above words are adjectives, and *nothing else*. It is true, they have not always a noun expressed after them, but then they have always one understood. The sentence is, in that case, elliptical; but it would be strange to argue that the ellipsis changed the part of speech of the word. I forbear saying more on this subject here, because in Appendix B I have endeavoured to prove, at some length, the general position, that no word is ever more than one part of speech.

Upon the whole, we need never, I think, be at a loss to determine the noun and adjective. We

one person's. We say, besides, *a few oranges, many a time, such a figure, what a wonder*. Lastly, *own* never occurs but between the pronominal adjective and the noun; as, *my own house*. These peculiarities, however, do not affect their general character as adjectives.

have seen that the adjective precedes and designates the noun ; and this rule for the adjective furnishes us with one for the noun, which perhaps may be more easy of application than the definition given at the beginning of this section, a rule being always more intelligible and tangible than a definition ; for the noun is evidently that word which is preceded and designated *by* the adjective : so that if we previously know *one* of these parts of speech, we can scarcely fail to ascertain the other. Thus, if it be asked, what part of speech is the word *early* ? I find I can say, an early hour ; and if I know *hour* to be a noun, I am then sure that *early* is an adjective. In the same manner, I discover the parts of speech of such words as *little, much, enough, former, latter, near, like, &c.*, because I can say, little wine, much bread, enough water, the former epistle, the latter sentence, a near view, a like occurrence.* And conversely, if I want to ascertain the parts of speech of the words *advantage, degree, service, system, confidence, &c.*, I find I can put adjectives before

* I shall have occasion to make a further remark on the words *near* and *like* when we come to Prepositions. Their apparent use *as* prepositions, will be easily accounted for, without its being necessary to class them *with* prepositions.

them, and say, a great advantage, a high degree, an important service, a regular system, implicit confidence; and hence I may infer that the words in question are nouns. This will generally be found a short and simple, and for the most part, a correct method of ascertaining the noun as well as the adjective.

There are four other words to be noticed under this Section, because I hope to make it appear that they are to be considered as each a noun and adjective in a state of combination. I mean the words *ours*, *yours*, *hers*, and *theirs*. Our Grammarians find no difficulty in disposing of these words. They call them possessive cases of pronouns, and in so calling them, think they have done all that is necessary; though they, strangely enough, assign other possessive cases to the very same pronouns. Thus they call *her* and *hers*, the possessives of *she*; *our* and *ours* of *we*; *your* and *yours* of *you*; *their* and *theirs* of *they*! This may satisfy those who are contented to take the *ipse dixit* of the grammarian in the place of reason and common sense; but to me, I confess, nothing can be more unsatisfactory. *Our*, *your*, *her*, and *their*, I have already shown to be pronominal adjectives; but with respect to the same words with

the *s* subjoined, I was for a long time at a loss to find a suitable denomination for them, there being no other words like them, in our, or in any other language. Possessive cases they cannot be : for all other possessive cases admit of nouns after them, which these do not. I am disposed then to consider them as the pronominal adjectives *our*, *your*, *her*, and *their*, combined with an antecedent noun ; for the final *s* will be found, in every instance to represent a noun previously referred to. Thus the sentences, " that house is ours," " these children are theirs," signify " that house is our-house," " these children are their-children ;" so that the true and only use of the *s* is to represent the noun already mentioned, to save the trouble of repetition : in other words, *ours* and *theirs* are pronominal adjectives and nouns in a state of combination ; and it is of course the same with *hers* and *yours*.* All I contend for is, that this is the modern force and signification of the *s* (which is

* It may be some help to the memory to consider the *s* as standing for the word *said* : thus, speaking of a house, we say, it is theirs, their-*s*, their-said, their-said-house.

Sometimes the noun represented by *s* is understood ; as in the phrase " I am yours truly," *i. e.* I am, my dear friend, yours, or your-friend truly. " I have received yours of the 15th inst." *i. e.* your-letter.

all we need be concerned about) whatever be its origin.

The sum of what has been said is this. The noun may be known from its being the name of any subject or object ; the adjective from its preceding and designating the noun. Or, when the adjective is previously known, the noun may be more conveniently determined from its being preceded and designated by the adjective. We have moreover,

1. Attributive Adjectives ; so called from their generally indicating the attribute of the noun, as *generous, large, sweet*.

2. Pronominal Adjectives ; from the pronoun ; as, *his, her, my*.

3. Definite Adjectives ; from their defining or limiting the noun ; as, *the, this, that*.

4. Indefinite Adjectives ; from their leaving the noun undefined or unlimited ; as, *a, any, some*.

The four words *ours, yours, hers, theirs*, are the pronominal adjectives, *our, your, her, their*, combined with an antecedent noun.

With respect to the foregoing classification of adjectives into four divisions, a better arrangement and nomenclature might perhaps be devised. My

chief object was to prove that the several classes of words alluded to, really *are* adjectives; or at least, that since they are all of one character, they ought to pass under one general name, whatever name may be thought most appropriate.

A few supplementary observations concerning Adjectives seem to be necessary.

The present and past participles of verbs are frequently *used adjectively*; as, a *pleasing* address, a *finished* picture.

Nouns are sometimes *used adjectively*; as, a *gold-ring*, *ship-stores*, *country-house*, *shell-fish*, *church-yard-cough*, &c.*

It would seem as if occasionally the same word were used both as a noun and an adjective; thus we say, a great *evil*, and an *evil* design; a *divine* being, and an eminent *divine*. The same remark will apply to the words *Christian*, *ritual*, *liquid*, *missionary*, *cold*, *cunning*, *original*, *private*, and a few more. As it is, however, one object of this work to show that words are not more than one

* Johnson calls *country* an adjective, because we say *country-house*. Might he not as well have called *cow* an adjective, because we say *cow-house*? Sometimes even a preposition is used adjectively, as, an *after-thought*, an *under-agent*; but we do not on that account call *after* and *under* adjectives.

part of speech, I would decide, that in all such cases, the word in question is *a noun used adjectively*, on the ground that it must have been a noun *before* it could be an adjective. Persons and objects must have existed before their qualities were thought of. It admits of proof that nouns and verbs were antecedent to all other parts of speech.

The foregoing is all that is necessary to be known concerning the Noun and the Adjective. Under the head of the Verb, will be found some observations on the Participle, which it is well known is nearly related to the Adjective.

Pronoun.

THIS part of speech is well named, because it explains itself. It is a word used instead of, or *for* a noun. Hence, WHATEVER WORD REPRESENTS A NOUN IS A PRONOUN.

The following are our nine pronouns with their nominative and objective cases.

| Nominative Cases. | Objective Cases. |
|-------------------|------------------|
| I..... | me |
| thou..... | thee |
| he..... | him |
| she..... | her |
| it..... | it |
| we..... | us |
| ye or you..... | you |
| they..... | them |
| who*..... | whom |

I have never been able to discover any pronouns except these; though in our grammars we read of pronouns *distributive, relative, absolute, demonstrative, substantive, indefinite, personal,*

* *Who* is exclusively called by our Grammarians, a *relative* pronoun; but is not every pronoun *relative*? Do they not all *relate* to the nouns for which they stand?

~~original, proposition, connective, indetermi-~~
~~nate, &c. &c.~~ distinctions which are worse than
 useless, and which have no existence but in the
 grammarian's creative fancy.

After what has been said page 22 concerning
 the words *which, what, this, that, there, those,*
such, each, another, &c., it is almost unnecessary
 to observe, that though all the grammars are
 pleased to call them *pronouns*, they are in fact
 not so, because they do not represent nouns ;
 but are *adjectives*, because they precede and de-
 signate nouns ; which nouns, when they are not
 expressed, are understood. This is so plain and
 obvious a distinction, that it is surprising these
 two parts of speech should have been so univer-
 sally confounded.*

When, in parsing, we meet with the words
him-self, them-selves, who-so, who-so-ever, &c., we
 can only say of them that they are *compounded*
pronouns, being compounds of the pronouns *him,*
them, who, and the affixes *self, so, ever.*†

* The German Grammarians make the distinction I con-
 tend for.

† The above compounds, together with *my-self, thy-*
self, your-self, our-selves, are not pronouns, properly so
 called, but are used merely to give *emphasis* to the pro-
 nouns ; like *lui-même* of the French, or *ego-met* of the
 Latin.

It may be proper to remark, that when we say "*he himself, or they themselves* did it,"—in order to account for the nominative and objective cases thus coming together *before* the verb, we must understand a preposition before the objective; thus, "*he (of or by) himself, they (of or by) themselves* did it"—the preposition, as we shall see presently, always governing the objective case of the pronoun.*

The sum is, that pronouns are representatives of nouns, and are nine in number, viz. the nominatives, *I, thou, he, &c.*, with their objectives *me, thee, him, &c.*

* This, I think, is a more natural way of accounting for the anomaly, than by supposing with Lowth and Johnson, that himself and themselves are, in such examples, corruptions for *hisself* and *theirselves*.

Verb.

THE Verb is so called because it is the chief word (verbum) in a sentence, and without which no sentence can be complete.

Generally speaking, it denotes Action, or Condition of Being ; and it is either transitive or intransitive ; that is, the action either passes from the actor to the object acted upon, or it is confined to the actor.

When the action is transitive, it includes the time and mode of its performance, together with the person or persons by whom, and those on whom the said action is performed ; whence we have Person, Time, Mode (or Mood) and what is called Voice.* Thus, in the sentences, " James raised John from the ground," " James dressed John," the person is James, the time is past, the mode is indicative (or declarative), and the voice is active ; the expression *Active Voice* signifying

* Why the word *Voice* (voix, vox, voco) should have been employed by Grammarians to describe the active and passive *state* of the verb, I have never been able to discover.

that the action passes from James to John, in contradistinction to what is called the *Passive Voice*, which denotes that John *is raised* from the ground, and *is dressed* by James. Moreover, the active voice of the transitive verb governs the objective case of the pronoun ; as, “ I dress *him*.”

When the action is intransitive, we have only person, time, and mode ; as in the sentences, “ James rises at six o'clock,” “ James dresses himself,” the person is James, the time is present, the mode is indicative.*

I would propose the following simple rule for recognising the VERB ; it is A WORD BEFORE WHICH THE NOMINATIVE CASES OF THE PRONOUNS MAY BE USED. This will be found more comprehensive than the ordinary definition of *being, doing, and suffering* ; for (to say nothing of the impropriety of defining verbs *by* verbs) to look, to think, to stand, to sit, &c., are neither to be, do, nor suffer ; but we may say, I look, thou lookest, he looks, &c., I think, thou thinkest, &c., I stand, &c., which is the best proof that these

* The French express this distinction between the transitive and intransitive action more elegantly than we do. With them *lever* is to raise, *se lever* to rise ; *habiller* to dress another, *s'habiller* to dress one's self.

are verbs. The same rule includes the nominative pronoun *who* ; for we say, I who love, thou who lovest, he who loves ; or, interrogatively, who loves ?

I purpose giving first a summary view of the Auxiliary verbs, and then of the Regular verb and Participle, referring the reader to any Grammar for a list of the Irregular verbs, which, however, are better learnt from conversation than from books.*

I shall make two preliminary observations :—
FIRST, I have deviated from what is usually given in Grammars, as to the number and arrangement of Auxiliary verbs. I reckon fourteen of them in all, of which five are Indicative, and nine Contingent. To *ought*, I have assigned an *Incumbent* mood ; while *must* and *let* are classed together under the head of the *Imperative*. The effect of this last arrangement is to give a past time to the Imperative, which it could not have while *let* only belonged to it. SECONDLY, The Auxiliaries *should*, *would*, *might*, and *could*,

* According to Bishop Lowth, there are 4300 verbs in the English language, of which only 177 are irregular. He might have added that the irregular are most in use, and that it is probably for this very reason they have become mutilated and imperfect.

though originally the past times of *shall*, *will*, *may*, and *can* respectively, yet are not considered any longer in that light; as it will appear, on the most superficial examination, that these distinctions are now lost, and that each of the above terms has a force of its own, and must be taken by itself. In the same manner *ought* was originally the past time of the verb *to owe*, but it must now be considered as a distinct verb.

The following Table contains the fourteen auxiliary verbs, and shows at the same time the manner in which they are used as the moods of English verbs in general.

| | | | | |
|----------------------------|---|------------------------------|---|---|
| INDICATIVE AUXILIARIES. | { | I HAVE, thou hast, &c. | { | INDICATIVE MOOD, so called, because <i>indicating</i> the action done, being done, or that is to be done. |
| | | I AM, thou art, &c. | | |
| | | I DO, thou dost, &c. | | |
| | | I SHALL, thou shalt, &c. | | |
| | | I WILL, thou wilt, &c. | | |
| CONTINGENT AUXILIARIES. | { | I SHOULD, thou shouldst, &c. | { | CONDITIONAL MOOD, implying that the action depends on a <i>condition</i> . |
| | | I WOULD, thou wouldst, &c. | | |
| | { | I MAY, thou mayst, &c. | { | POTENTIAL MOOD, denoting the <i>power</i> to perform an action. |
| | | I MIGHT, thou mightst, &c. | | |
| | | I CAN, thou canst, &c. | | |
| | { | I COULD, thou couldst, &c. | { | INCUMBENT MOOD, showing the <i>duty</i> to perform an action. |
| | | I OUGHT, thou oughtst, &c. | | |
| | { | I MUST, thou must, &c. | { | IMPERATIVE MOOD, signifying an <i>order</i> or <i>request</i> to perform an action. |
| | | LET..... | | |

It thus appears that the auxiliary verbs are divided into two classes ; namely, five Indicative and nine Contingent,—the former constituting one Indicative Mood, and the latter four Contingent Moods, viz. a Conditional, Potential, Incumbent, and Imperative Mood. I do not consider what is called the Infinitive as a mood, any more than the Participle ; on the ground that they contain no affirmation or command, properties which ought, I think, to be deemed essential to a mood.

Respecting the conjugation of the Indicative auxiliaries *to have*, *to be*, and *to do*, and that of the Indicative Mood of verbs generally, I would remark that, whatever may be predicated of past time, must equally be predicated of present and future time ; in other words, whatever state or stage an action was in yesterday, it may be in at the present moment, or may be in to-morrow. So that there are Three Times in every verb, *past*, *present*, and *future* : and there must be the same number and denomination (whatever that number and denomination may chance to be) of States of Action in *each* of the said three times. The number of these States of Action in the English verb, I conceive to be three, and that they ought

to be denominated *Finished*, *Unfinished*, and *Indefinite*.

In accordance with this principle, I will here give an outline of the conjugation of the three

INDICATIVE AUXILIARIES,

to have, *to be*, and *to do*, with their Infinitives and Participles. The other two Indicative auxiliaries *shall* and *will* are only used to express the future time of the Indicative mood.

| | | |
|------------|------------|---------------------------------------|
| PAST TIME, | finished | { I had had, thou, &c. |
| | | { I had been, thou, &c. |
| | | { I had done, thou, &c. |
| | unfinished | { I was having, thou, &c. |
| | | { I was being (or getting), thou, &c. |
| | | { I was doing, thou, &c. |
| | indefinite | { I had, thou, &c. |
| | | { I was, thou, &c. |
| | | { I did, thou, &c. |

| | | |
|---------------|------------|--------------------------|
| PRESENT TIME, | finished | { I have had, thou, &c. |
| | | { I have been, thou, &c. |
| | | { I have done, thou, &c. |
| | unfinished | { I am having, thou, &c. |
| | | { I am being, thou, &c. |
| | | { I am doing, thou, &c. |
| | indefinite | { I have, thou, &c. |
| | | { I am, thou, &c. |
| | | { I do, thou, &c. |

| | | |
|--------------|------------|--|
| FUTURE TIME. | finished | I shall or will* have had, thou, &c. |
| | | I shall or will have been, thou, &c. |
| | | I shall or will have done, thou, &c. |
| | unfinished | I shall or will be having, thou, &c. |
| | | I shall or will be being (or getting), thou, &c. |
| | | I shall or will be doing, thou, &c. |
| | indefinite | I shall or will have, thou, &c. |
| | | I shall or will be, thou, &c. |
| | | I shall or will do, thou, &c. |

INFINITIVES.

| | |
|----------|--|
| PAST. | To have had, to have been, to have done. |
| PRESENT. | To have, to be, to do. |
| FUTURE. | To be about to have. |
| | To be about to be. |
| | To be about to do. |

PARTICIPLES.

| | |
|----------|-----------------------|
| PAST. | Had, been, done. |
| PRESENT. | Having, being, doing. |
| FUTURE. | About to have. |
| | About to be. |
| | About to do. |

The four Contingent moods of these verbs are now to be exhibited, together with those of verbs in general, under the head of

CONTINGENT AUXILIARIES.

The following sentences (amounting to not less than three hundred and thirty-six, if we include

* The rule for *shall* and *will* is somewhat complicated. It can only be learnt from correct practice.

all the persons) exhibit all the possible varieties in which the contingent auxiliaries can be used, except what relates to *let*, which will be given afterwards.

| | | | | |
|-------------------|--------------|-------------------|-------|--------------------|
| CONDI- TIONAL. | { I should | have, thou, &c. | | |
| | { I could | be, thou, &c. | | |
| POTEN- TIAL. | { I may | do, thou, &c. | | |
| | { I might | dress, thou, &c. | Act. | |
| | { I can | be dressed, thou, | Pass. | } REGULAR.* |
| | { I could | &c. | | |
| INCUM- BENT. | { I ought to | draw, thou, &c. | Act. | } IRREGU- LAR.* |
| IMPE- RATIVE. | { I must | be drawn, thou, | Pass. | |
| | | &c. | | |

In these sentences (which it will be observed only express the Condition, Power, Duty, and Obligation of acting) there is evidently very little reference to *time*; for the action being contingent, that is, doubtful whether it be performed at all, it is impossible to fix the time of its performance. Notwithstanding, we may perhaps be justified in assigning to the above sentences, ONE PRESENT TIME, on the ground, that when we speak of the power, duty, or obligation to do any thing, these

* The verbs *to dress* and *to draw* are selected merely as examples of a regular and irregular verb. It is well known that the only distinction between these two kinds of verbs, consists in the former expressing its past time by the termination *ed*, and the latter by a different one.

must be present to us at the moment, even though we should never carry the act into execution.

When the same auxiliaries are compounded with the verb *to have*, and the past participle of the following verb, they may, for a similar reason, be said to have ONE PAST TIME,* thus,

| | | | | | |
|----------------------|-----------------------|---------------|----------------------------------|---|-------------------|
| CONDITIO- TIONAL. | { I should I could | { <i>have</i> | had, thou, &c. | { | REGU- LAR. |
| | | | been, thou, &c. | | |
| POTEN- TIAL. | { I may I might | | done, thou, &c. | | |
| | { I can I could | | dressed, thou, &c. <i>Act.</i> | | |
| | | | been dressed, thou, <i>Pass.</i> | | |
| INCUM- BENT. | { I ought to | | drawn, thou, &c. <i>Act.</i> | | { IRREGU- LAR. |
| IMPE- RATIVE. | { I must | | been drawn, thou, <i>Pass.</i> | | |

It deserves notice that, in the foregoing contin-

* One great mistake of our Grammarians is their having divided the contingent moods of English verbs into several successive tenses. It is true, that for the reason given above (and for the convenience of parsing) I have assigned one present time to the contingent auxiliaries in their simple state, and one past time to them when compounded; but this is the very utmost they possess; and it is only in a restricted sense that they can be said to possess so much. Yet what say our Grammarians? They inform us that *may* and *can* are PRESENT; that *should*, *would*, *might*, and *could*, are IMPERFECT; that *may* and *can have* are PERFECT; and that *should*, *would*, *might*, and *could have* are PLUPERFECT! that is, four successive tenses are ascribed to verbs, for which the utmost stretch of the imagination can only find two! If mistakes are to be made, let them at least be made on the side of simplicity and not of confusion.

gent auxiliaries, *ought* is the only one which retains the infinitive sign *to* after it. Once, however, the others had it also, as might easily be shown by a reference to their etymology. And not only they, but *do*, *shall*, *will*, and *let* besides, though they have now dropped it.* But in *parsing*, we must understand it, and call the verb which follows in the infinitive. Thus, in the sentences, “ I do, shall, will, may, might, can, could, should, would, and must dress,” and also in “ let him dress,” the verb *dress* is in the infinitive.†

English verbs, moreover, have the power of assuming (under certain limitations) what may properly be called a *Hypothetical Form*;‡ and this, like the contingent moods, has two times, one present and one past ; thus,

* “ Abbreviations and corruptions are always busiest with the words which are most frequently in use : letters, like soldiers, being very apt to desert and drop in a long march.”—*Diversions of Purley*.

† If the reader will translate these phrases into French, he will see at once the necessity of the verb *dress* being in the infinitive. The phrase “ let him dress” is, in other words, “ permit him *to* dress.”

‡ I call it a *form* in contradistinction to a *mood*, because it contains a supposition only, and not an assertion.

PRESENT HYPOTHETICAL FORM OF VERBS.

| | | | |
|-----------------------------------|---|---|-------|
| If, Though, Unless, &c.* | { | I were, thou wert, he were, | |
| | | I be, thou be, he be, we be, you be, they | |
| | | thou have, he have, | be. |
| | | thou do, he do, | |
| | | thou dress, he dress. | Act. |
| | | I be, thou be, he be, &c. dressed. | Pass. |

PAST HYPOTHETICAL FORM OF VERBS.

| | | | |
|----------------------------------|---|---|-------|
| If, Though, Unless, &c. | { | thou have been, he have been, | |
| | | thou have had, he have had, | |
| | | thou have done, he have done, | |
| | | thou have dressed, he have dressed. | Act. |
| | | thou have been dressed, he have been dressed. | Pass. |

All the parts of verbs, whether auxiliary, regular, or irregular (with the single exception of the Imperative *let*), are capable of being used hypothetically, by putting before them the words *if*, *though*, *unless*, &c. : but the above are the only parts in which the hypothetical form can be *distinguished*. The other parts undergo no variation when so used.

* The number and character of these words will come under our consideration hereafter. It is scarcely necessary to remark that, in the above sentences, some one or other of the contingent auxiliaries is understood between the pronoun and the verb : generally it is *should* ; as, if thou (shouldst) have, though he (should) dress.

Before quitting the contingent auxiliaries, I will here give a full view of the Imperative Mood of English verbs, as connected with the two auxiliaries *let* and *must*. Above we could do no more than advert to it as it related to *must*.

IMPERATIVE MOOD OF VERBS.

| | | | |
|--------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------|
| | | (had, thou, &c. | |
| | | (been, thou, &c. | |
| PAST, I must have, | | done, thou, &c. | |
| | | (dressed, thou, &c.Act. | |
| | | (been dressed, thou, &c...Pass. | |
| PRESENT. | (Let me, | (or I must | } have. |
| | (Have, be, do, dress thou, | (or thou must | |
| | (Let him, | (or he must | |
| | (Let us, | (or we must | |
| | (Have, be, do, dress you, | (or you must | |
| | (Let them, | (or they must | } bedressed. Pass. |
| | | | |

The foregoing will be found to comprehend all that relates to the Indicative and Contingent auxiliary verbs, together with the Conditional, Potential, Incumbent, and Imperative Moods, and Hypothetical forms of verbs generally. It now only remains that we give the Indicative Mood of the

REGULAR VERB.

The only thing to be premised is, that our Grammarians show far too great an anxiety to tread in the steps of their Greek and Latin predecessors,

both in limiting the number of the tenses of the verb, and in bestowing upon them the almost unintelligible names of "simple and compound preterite," "first and second preterimperfect," "first and second preterpluperfect," "compound of the present," "compound of the past," "present perfect," "past perfect," "preterite anterior," "future anterior," &c. &c. The following outline of the Active and Passive voice of the verb *to dress* (in conformity with the principle adopted in the indicative auxiliaries) will, perhaps, be found more simple and satisfactory :—

| | | |
|---------------|------------|---|
| PAST TIME. | finished | { <i>Act.</i> I had dressed, thou, &c. <i>Pass.</i> I had been dressed, thou, &c. |
| | unfinished | { <i>Act.</i> I was dressing, thou, &c. <i>Pass.</i> I was being (or getting) dressed, thou, &c. |
| | indefinite | { <i>Act.</i> I dressed or did dress, thou, &c. <i>Pass.</i> I was dressed, thou, &c. |
| PRESENT TIME. | finished | { <i>Act.</i> I have dressed,* thou, &c. <i>Pass.</i> I have been dressed, thou, &c. |
| | unfinished | { <i>Act.</i> I am dressing, thou, &c. <i>Pass.</i> I am being (or getting) dressed, thou, &c. |
| | indefinite | { <i>Act.</i> I dress, or do dress, thou, &c. <i>Pass.</i> I am dressed, thou, &c. |

* "I have dressed," which is given as the finished action of the present time, may, perhaps, appear to some, very like a past time; but, upon reflection, it will be found that the idea of present time is, in the above instance, necessarily

| | | |
|--------------|------------|---|
| FUTURE TIME. | finished | <i>Act.</i> I shall or will have dressed, thou, &c. |
| | | <i>Pass.</i> I shall or will have been dressed, thou, &c. |
| | unfinished | <i>Act.</i> I shall or will be dressing, thou, &c. |
| | | <i>Pass.</i> I shall or will be being (or getting) dressed, thou, &c. |
| | indefinite | <i>Act.</i> I shall or will dress, thou, &c. |
| | | <i>Pass.</i> I shall or will be dressed, thou, &c. |

conveyed by the auxiliary *have*, which denotes, no doubt, that the action is finished, but that the speaker continues to *have*, *hold*, or *possess* the action in a finished state; that is, he *remains dressed* at the time of speaking; for if he were subsequently to undress, he would no longer say, "I have dressed," but "I dressed," or "I had dressed."

Other *seeming* tenses, besides these given above, might be enumerated; but the objection to them will be found to be two-fold; 1st, They are incapable of the three modifications of past, present, and future; and, 2d, they do not express specific acts at specific times, but intended, interrupted, or ambiguous acts; as, "I was to dress," "I was to have dressed," "I had been dressing," "I had to dress," "I am to dress," "I have to dress," &c.

The indicative mood of the Latin, French, and German verb may be divided similarly to that of the English verb, excepting, that instead of three, they only admit of two states of action for each time; thus,

| | | | |
|-------|--------------------|---|----------------------------|
| PAST. | (Laudabam, | } | I praised or was praising. |
| | Je louois, | | |
| | Ich lobete, | | |
| | (Laudaveram, | } | I had praised. |
| | Je louai, | | |
| | (Ich hatte gelobt, | | |

| | | | |
|----------|-------------------|---|-----------------|
| PRESENT. | (Laudo, | } | I praise. |
| | Je loue, | | |
| | Ich lobe, | | |
| | (Laudavi, | } | I have praised. |
| | J'ai loué, | | |
| | (Ich habe gelobt, | | |

INFINITIVES.

| | | | |
|----------|---|--------------|---------------------------------------|
| PAST. | { | <i>Act.</i> | To have dressed. |
| | { | <i>Pass.</i> | To have been dressed. |
| PRESENT. | { | <i>Act.</i> | To dress. |
| | { | <i>Pass.</i> | To be dressed. |
| FUTURE. | { | <i>Act.</i> | To be about (or going) to dress. |
| | { | <i>Pass.</i> | To be about (or going) to be dressed. |

PARTICIPLES.

| | | | |
|----------|---|--------------|----------------------|
| PAST. | { | <i>Act.</i> | Having dressed. |
| | { | <i>Pass.</i> | Having been dressed. |
| PRESENT. | { | <i>Act.</i> | Dressing. |
| | { | <i>Pass.</i> | Being dressed. |
| FUTURE. | { | <i>Act.</i> | About to dress. |
| | { | <i>Pass.</i> | About to be dressed. |

Intransitive verbs may, in general, be conjugated like the active voice of the regular verb; only that some of them, it will be found, do not admit of an equal number of states of action; particularly those which express conditions of being that are involuntary; as, to languish, to become, to fall, to smile, to shine, to seem.

Having had occasion to introduce the past, present, and future participles, in the conjugation of

| | | | | |
|---------|---|-------------------------|---|---|
| FUTURE. | { | Laudabo, | { | I shall or will praise or be praising. |
| | | Je louerai, | | |
| | { | Ich werde loben, | | I shall or will have praised. |
| | | Laudavero, | | |
| | | J'aurai loué, | | |
| | | Ich werde gelobt haben, | | |

the verb ; and to show (under the head of the Adjective) that the two first are often used adjectively, I will now proceed to what remains to be said on the subject of the

PARTICIPLE,

Which denotes a word *partaking* of the character both of the verb and adjective : of the former, from its indicating certain conditions of action, or being in a given subject ; of the latter, from its pointing out certain attributes or properties in the said subject.

What I have chiefly to notice here, is a peculiar class of words, which I propose distinguishing by the name of *Indeterminate Participles*. I use the word *Indeterminate* with reference to *time*. All other participles are sufficiently determined by their past, present, and future appellatives ; but the under-mentioned have no time belonging to them, beyond what the accidental construction of the sentence in which they occur, assigns to them. It is singular that none of our grammarians have distinctly noticed them, and our lexicographers seem also to have been at a loss in what light to consider them. The following list contains all, or nearly

all the words in question ; and exhibits, at the same time, the manner in which they all admit of being used, viz. with any part of the verb *to be* before them. and a preposition after them ; thus,

Being accessory to

- *conversant with*
- *desirous of*
- *averse to or from*
- *comparable to*
- *unable to or for*
- *aware of*
- *unaware of*
- *afraid of*
- *liable to*
- *capable of*
- *incapable of*
- *consonant to*
- *mindful of*

Being regardless of

- *condemne to*
- *abhorrent to*
- *compatible with*
- *referable to*
- *devoid of*
- *pursuant to*
- *subversive of*
- *incident to*
- *consequent upon*
- *prone to*
- *subject to*
- *commensurate with*
- *coeval with.*

Now, it will be seen that these words cannot be verbs, according to our rule, since they do not admit the nominative cases of the pronouns immediately before them ; nor can they be adjectives, since they cannot be made to precede and designate nouns. At the same time, they partake of the nature of adjectives, from their indicating certain *attributes* in the subject referred to ; and they

partake of the nature of verbs, from their indicating certain *conditions of being* in the same subject. They are, therefore, Participles, and may, accordingly, be always used as such.

There are two words which come nearer to the Indeterminate Participle than to any other part of speech, and yet slightly differ from it, on which account they may be called Anomalous Participles, viz. *wont* and *worth*. *Wont* requires after it the infinitive of a verb ; as, “ he was wont to say.” *Worth* affects the word which follows it without the intervention of a preposition ; as, “ it is worth a shilling.” These are anomalies from which no language is exempt ; but in parsing, it is proper to notice them. They are the only anomalies I have discovered under the head of the participle or verb.

While I am upon the Participle, I would observe that such words as unwilling, undeserving, unresisting, unpretending, &c., should be called *compounded present participles* ; and that undeserved, unresisted, unaccustomed, unprotected, &c., be called *compounded past participles*, being compounded of the inseparable prefix *un*, and participles of existing verbs. These words are

called *adjectives* by our lexicographers ; but, surely, when a word is distinguished by a peculiar and obvious character, that ought to be designated in parsing.

There are, indeed, several words which have the past participle termination, but which, as they are not derived from existing verbs, are adjectives only ; as, cragged, crabbed, naked, insulated, crested, turreted : particularly compound terms ; as, able-bodied, good-natured, bare-headed, evil-minded, &c.

In the use of the different tenses, moods, and participles of the verbs, considerable latitude is used in conversation, and certain minute shades of distinction exist, which can only be understood by familiarity with the language, and by intercourse with correct speakers. This rather belongs to the province of Syntax, on which I do not profess to enter. The outline I have given of the verb, though not, perhaps, altogether perfect, seems to me more complete, and less liable to objection, than any other I have met with. More might have been attempted ; but changes even for the better, sometimes do harm, when made with too

great nicety, or pushed beyond certain limits For every purpose of parsing, the foregoing will be found abundantly sufficient.

The sum of the whole is this,—the verb may always be known from its admitting the nominative cases of the pronouns before it ; as, *I dress, thou readest, he who rides, &c.*

The auxiliary verbs are fourteen in number. Five of these are indicative ; as, *I have, am, do, shall, will.* The other nine are contingent ; as, *I should, would, may, might, can, could, ought, must, and let.* These last are considered as possessing, in their simple state, one present time, and one past time when compounded ; and they serve also to express the conditional, potential, incumbent, and imperative moods of verbs generally.

The regular verb, aided by its incorporated terminations, and the indicative auxiliaries, has one past time, one present, and one future ; each of which is subdivided into three states of action, viz. finished, unfinished, and indefinite.

All the parts of verbs may be thrown into the Hypothetical form ; but there is only a limited number of parts by the structure or inflection of which this form can be distinguished.

Lastly, there are a certain number of words which may be denominated *Indeterminate Participles*. as *sworn*, *married*, *afraid*, *comparable*, *deserted* &c.

Preposition.

THE primary characteristic of the Preposition is, that it affects *words* in contradistinction to *sentences*; namely, nouns, adjectives, pronouns, and participles; and, in particular, ANY WORD, NOT BEING A VERB, WHICH GOVERNS THE OBJECTIVE CASE OF A PRONOUN, IS A PREPOSITION.

The following list includes all the prepositions, of which there are thirty-seven:—around, amidst, about, among, along, across, against, after, at, above, below, before, beneath, behind, by, beyond, besides, between, but,* except, for, from,

* *But*, when it has a negative or exceptive force (as, “thou shalt have no other Gods *but me*”), is a preposition, and governs the objective case of the pronoun. Hence the sentence in Mark xii. “there is none other God *but he*,” should, unquestionably, be “there is none other God *but him*.” When *but* denotes that something is to be added to what went before (as, “lead us not into temptation, *but* deliver us from evil,”) it is an adverb, as will appear hereafter.

The preposition *but* is etymologically *be-out*, or remove, withdraw; and is compounded of the imperative *be* and the adverb *out*; and it may be remarked that *below*, *before*, *beneath*, *behind*, *beyond*, *besides*, *between*, are equally compounded of the same verb, and their respective adverbs. It is also a singular coincidence that the preposition *with-out* is from the same root as *but* or *be-out* (see *Diversi*

in, into, our, on, of, off, save,* through, to, towards, upon, under, with, within, without.

These may at once be known from their requiring after them the objective cases *him, her, them, me, you, us, or whom.*†

of Purley, vol. i. p. 215), and hence, in Old English, *but* is frequently used for *without*; as, in the Jacobite song,

“*But* the hose and *but* the breeks.”

“*But* doubt” is a common expression in Gavin Douglas.

The other *but* was formerly (and ought still to be) written *bot*, being the comparative of the old Saxon verb *botan*, to add. Hence our phrase *to boot*, or, in addition. The French *mais* (magis) has the very same meaning. *But* is one of the few words in the English language that are *two parts of speech*; and it arises from the two above-mentioned words, which are in origin and meaning so widely different, having become accidentally confounded.

* On the principle that the preposition must govern the objective case, the word *they* in Matt. xix. “*Save they to whom it is given,*” should be *them*; accordingly we have elsewhere, “*Save Jesus Christ and him crucified.*”

† The preposition might be named the *objectative* (objectatus), to denote that it governed the objective case of the pronoun.

The rule I have given for determining the preposition, is supported by the analogy of the Greek and Latin languages, the prepositions of which constantly govern a *case* of all these parts of speech which possess cases. It is the same in German.

I have not admitted *since* or *till* among the prepositions, because we do not usually say *since* or *till him, me, &c.*; but, *since my time, till his time, &c.* For the same reason I have excluded *up* and *down*, because, instead of *up him, down him, &c.*, we rather say, *up his arm, down his back, &c.*

There is reason to believe that all the prepositions are fragments of transitive verbs, and that it is in virtue of their

There are a few expressions, such as, *nigh to*, *as to*, *with respect to*, *according to*, *on account of*, *in spite of*, which may be said to be used *as* prepositions ; at the same time, it is only in virtue of the concluding words *of* and *to*, that they are entitled to this rank.

being so, that they require the objective case after them. Many of them are known to be such ; others can be traced to Saxon or Gothic nouns, which nouns had been probably past participles of verbs ; it being well known that nouns and verbs are often the same word, differing only by a prefix or termination. The circumstance of the preposition governing the objective case, seems to have escaped Tooke ; at least he does not notice or account for it. He shows e. g. that *through* means a door or passage ; but then a noun can never govern an objective case ; and hence it seems reasonable to conclude that the word was previously a verb, or became one subsequently.

With reference to a Note in p. 25, respecting the words *like* and *near*, we use the objective case after them, and say, *like or near me, him, &c.*, which may seem at first sight, to give these words a claim to be ranked among prepositions. But the truth is, our ancestors write “ *like to or unto me, him, &c.*,” “ *near to or unto me, him, &c.*,” the objective being, as usual, governed by the preposition *to* or *unto*. Custom has, however, retained the objective, and dropped the preposition. But this cannot change the character of the words *near* and *like*, which I have already shown to be adjectives. We sometimes say, in the same manner, “ *he lives opposite us*,” i. e. opposite *to* us ; opposite being an adjective, and incapable of governing a case.

Sometimes prepositions are annexed or prefixed to verbs in such a way that the original meaning of both is lost or modified ; in which case, we must consider the combination as forming new verbs ; as, *to take-off*, *to take-in*, *to put-off*, *to look-after*, *to take-up-with*, *to let-on*, *to over-take*, *to under-take*, *to with-hold*, *to with-draw*.

The present participles *respecting, concerning, touching, excepting, saving, &c.*, may also be said to be used *as* prepositions, but it is only in their *verbal capacity* that they govern the objective case.

According to Johnson and others, many of the prepositions are adverbs as well as prepositions ; but in Appendix C, I have, I trust, shown this to be a mistake.

The sum is, that there are thirty-seven prepositions, which may always be known from their admitting after them the objective case of the pronouns ; as, *by them, for us, in whom, &c.*

Conjunction.

As it is the primary characteristic of the Preposition to affect *words*, and, in particular, to govern the objective case of the Pronoun : so it is that of the CONJUNCTION to affect *sentences* ; and, in particular, it GOVERNS THE HYPOTHETICAL FORM OF VERBS.

Though there be many words in our language used conjunctively, there are only eight which can properly be called Conjunctions ; namely, *if, though (or although), unless, lest, notwithstanding, whether, till (or until), and ere*. Thus we say, or ought, in strictness of speech, to say,—

| | | | | | | |
|-----------|---|---------|-------------|---------------------|--------|--------------|
| If, | { | I were, | thou wert, | he were, | | |
| Though, | | I be, | thou be, | he be, | we be, | you be, they |
| Unless, | | | | | | be. |
| Lest, | | | thou have, | he have, | | |
| Notwith- | | | thou do, | he do, | | |
| standing, | | | thou dress, | he dress. | | |
| Whether, | | I be, | thou be, | he be, &c. dressed. | | Act. |
| Till, | | | | | | Pass. |
| Ere.* | | | | | | |

* As a general principle, one would say that the Conjunction, denoting contingency, ought to have no affinity with the Indicative Mood, which denotes certainty. This rule, notwithstanding, is often violated, not only in Eng-

There is one partial exception to this rule, namely, with respect to *till* as applicable to the auxiliary *were*. When this verb refers to *time past*, we cannot say, till I were, but, till I was ; as, “ He stopped *till I was* dressed,” not “ *till I were* dressed.” The rule, however, holds good in all the other instances ; and these, if we include each person, amount to one hundred and sixty-five.

The general signification of the above eight Conjunctions is, that something is supposed, anticipated, doubted, or admitted, in contradistinction to its being positively ascertained.* And hence

lish, but in Greek, Latin, and French. In English, the above are the only parts of verbs by which the Hypothetical form can be distinguished from the other parts ; yet our modern writers seem to think it a matter of little consequence whether these or the indicative mood follow the conjunction : and not only so, but the same writer at one time follows the rule, and at another neglects it, without any reason beyond the caprice of the moment ! *Usus* is the great *norma loquendi* as well as *scribendi*, and to its authority we must bow, however capricious or unreasonable it may be. But though often broken, the rule is, nevertheless, a sound one, abstractly considered, and may, therefore, serve to distinguish the conjunction from the other parts of speech.

* *If* is *yif*, *gif*, *give*, give or grant. Thus we have in the old song, of “ Peblis to the Play,” the same word used for both the conjunction and the verb,—

And *gif* ye will *gif* me richt nocht,
The meikill devill gang wi’ you.

Though, *lest*, and *unless*, are fully explained by Tooke ;

it is that the same rule applies to all imperatives and participles of verbs (and generally to all terms and expressions), which denote doubt, supposition,

and together with *if*, so generally govern the hypothetical form of verbs, that it is useless giving examples.

It may be observed, however, respecting *though* (which is the imperative of a verb signifying *admit* or *suppose*), that notwithstanding we find it nearly as often followed by the indicative mood as by the hypothetical form, yet there is far from being any necessity for this. Thus we have in our Bible translation—"who, *though he was* rich, yet for our sakes became poor:" but since there is no *doubt* as to the fact here alluded to, the indicative *was* should be preserved, and *though* got rid of; which might easily be done thus—"who *was* rich (or who being rich), yet for our sakes became poor." Now since we have the phrase "*though he was* rich," we might naturally expect to find the same phrase in a corresponding passage, viz. "*though he was* a Son, yet learned he obedience by the things which he suffered." But such is the general disregard to all rule in these instances, that we find instead, "*though he were* a Son," &c. Here again, for the same reason as before, the indicative should be used, and the conjunction discarded. The same remark will equally apply to the example, "and *although we be* unworthy, through our manifold sins, &c.;" and in short, in all such cases, it is easy to change the construction of the sentence, so that both the sense and the grammar may be preserved inviolate.

There is another observation to be made here. The verb is frequently understood only, instead of being expressed, after some of the conjunctions. The following is an example of its being understood after *though*. "It will be easy to get a deed of gift—we must talk about it, *though*."—(ANTIQUARY.) i. e. "*Though it be* easy to get a deed of gift, we must talk about it."

The conjunction *Notwithstanding* is evidently notwithstanding, i. e. not-opposing, or not-denying, or granting.

command, caution, or contingency; which verbs, terms, and expressions, since they belong to other Parts of Speech, may be said to be *used conjunctively*; e. g. whoever, whatever, suppose, supposing, or it being supposed; take care, or let him take care; grant or granted; granting, allowing, admitting, providing, and all similar present par-

The verb is generally understood after this conjunction. "Jesus saith unto Peter, then are the children free; *notwithstanding*, lest we should offend them, go," &c. i. e. notwithstanding this circumstance, or notwithstanding the children *be* free, lest we should offend them, go, &c.

Johnson calls *Whether* a *pronoun* and an *adverb*! But it will be found, upon the slightest examination, that all his examples resolve themselves (by supplying the ellipsis) into our conjunctional use of the word. The Latin *utrum*, and the French *soi-que* point the same way: and in our Bible translation we have, "so then *whether it were* I or they, so we preached, and so ye believed;" "*whether he be* a sinner or no, I know not."

With respect to *Till*, which is a contraction for *to-while* (*while* being synonymous with *time*), its conjunctional character seems determined by the *dum* and *donec* of the Latin, and the *jusqu'à ce que* of the French, together with the fact of its being invariably (when the construction admits of it) followed by the hypothetical form in our Bible translation; as, "under the shadow of thy wings shall be my refuge, *until this tyranny be overpast*." "Doth she not seek diligently *till she find it*?" Here also the verb is sometimes understood; as, "Let both grow together *until the harvest*." i. e. until the harvest *come*.

I am doubtful as to the etymology of *Ere*. Hollingshed thus spells and uses the word, "*yer it were* perceived what he had done." In the New Testament we have, "come down *ere* my child *die*."

ticiples; provided; be it, albeit (all-be-it); in case; on condition; beware; remember; God grant, or would to God; would that; O that, &c. &c.

Some of these are of more general application than others; but none of them are, or at least ought to be, followed by the indicative mood of the verb—always excepting of course those persons and tenses which are common to the hypothetical form and indicative mood.

There are three prepositions which are sometimes used as conjunctions, *except*, *before*, and *without*,—thus, “That which thou sowest is not quickened *except it die*.” “Like corn blasted *before it be grown up*.” “Show me the turn my Sandie daur do about the house, *without it be just to tak his meat and drink and his diversion like ony of the weans*.”—(ANTIQUARY.)

The definite adjective *that* may be either inserted or omitted after the conjunctions, and the words used as such: for it is the same thing whether we say *if*, or *if that*; *though*, or *though that*; *in case I be there*, or *in case that I be there*, &c. I notice this, because Murray and others, not aware of the true force of *that* (which

is fully explained in Appendix B), have given it every name but the right one.*

It is evident that I restrict the conjunctions to a very small number compared with what our Grammarians do ; yet surely not without good reason : for it never can be right to class with the eight words given above (which, we have seen, have a distinguishing character belonging to them†) such words as *therefore*, *neither*, *nor*, *or*, *because*, *and*, *as*, *yet*, *nevertheless*, &c., which are totally destitute of that character. All such words I transfer to the adverbs, because they have not the characteristics of any of the other parts of speech. This is surely better than to class a certain number of them (as Murray and other Grammarians have done) under the head of *disjunctive conjunctions*, —of which the very name is sufficient to confuse and mislead by its heterogeneous combination.

* In the examples, “ Remember that *thou keep* holy the Sabbath day,” “ Let him take care that *he come* in time,” the hypothetical form is governed by the imperative of the verbs, and not by the word *that*, which might have been omitted without the least injury to either the sense or the grammar.—See Appendix B.

† They might be named *dubitatives*, or *suppositives*, from the contingency which they denote.

The sum is, that there are eight conjunctions, if, though, lest, unless, notwithstanding, whether, till, and ere ; whose distinguishing feature is, that they govern the hypothetical form of verbs. There are, besides, from twenty to thirty words or expressions (denoting contingency, and belonging to other parts of speech) which affect the same form of the verb in the same manner, and which, on this account, may be said to be used conjunctively ; *as, in case, suppose, except, provided, granting.*

Adverb.

UNDER the head of adverbs I include every word which does not clearly belong to some one or other of the parts of speech already mentioned : and consequently all those useless distinctions which pass under the name of *copulative*, *adversative*, *simple*, *casual*, *declarative*, *suspensive*, *illative*, &c. &c. conjunctions ; not to mention Ben Jonson's *separating*, *severing*, *sundering*, and *reasoning* conjunctions ! Interjections I would also include among adverbs, as they are too insignificant a set of words (if they deserve to be called words) to form a separate part of speech.* In short, the adverb can only be considered as a receptacle for all straggling, nondescript, and unclaimed words ; but which are of too multifarious a character to admit of either rule or definition.†

* B. Jonson observes, in his quaint manner, that " Interjections, commonly so called, are, in right, adverbs, such as these that follow, with their like : *ah ! alas ! was*, &c. ; *st.* a note of silence : *Rr*, that serveth to set days by the ears : *hrr*, to chase away birds."

† The adverb might be named the *non-descriptive*, *separative*, *inordinate*, or *exverb*, or any other name significant of its detached, lawless, or irregular character.

They may be compared to the "mixed multitude" of followers which generally constitute the rear of an army, being less known by any definite character than by the total *want* of character.

If, however, I have succeeded in giving distinct rules for the foregoing parts of speech, there is obviously the less reason for doing so in this instance. The only one that can be given is this, **WHENEVER A WORD IS CLEARLY NO OTHER PART OF SPEECH IT IS AN ADVERB.** This may not be thought very satisfactory; and yet the nature of the case will not admit of any thing more so.*

It would be easy to *class* adverbs, and they generally are classed in our popular grammars. For example, several are formed by the prefix *a*, as, astray, adrift, afoot, aside, abed, abreast, abroad, aboard; and others by the affix *ward*, as, upward, downward, inward, outward, forward, backward, hitherward, &c. Almost all the attri-

* Bishop Lowth says of adverbs, that "they denote some modification or circumstance of an action or quality; as the manner, order, time, place, distance, motion, relation, quantity, quality, comparison, doubt, affirmation, negation, demonstration, interrogation." It is clear that these can never be reduced under any one characteristic denomination.

butive adjectives (and they are by far the most numerous class of adjectives) are changed into adverbs by means of the termination *ly*, as, perfectly, advantageously, quickly, sweetly, pleasantly, &c. These admit degrees of comparison, as sweetly, more sweetly, most sweetly. In the same manner, present and past participles are changed into adverbs, as, charmingly, seemingly, affectedly, advisedly. Besides these, there are adverbs of *time*, as, then, now, to-day, to-morrow, yesterday; of *place*, as, here, there, up, down, hence, thence, &c.; of *order*, as, moreover, finally, once, twice, thrice, firstly, secondly, thirdly, &c. Lastly, many adverbs consist of two or three words (often belonging to other parts of speech) joined together; as, already (all-ready), alike (all-like), also (all-so), because (by-cause), needs (need-is), &c.; so also, no-thing, some-thing, there-of, there-upon, some-times, never-the-less, some-where, for-as-much, &c. &c.

In this manner it would be easy to subdivide the adverbs, if it could be made to answer any good purpose. Classification is necessary to separate things essentially different, or where inconvenience would arise from confounding them;

but beyond this point it should perhaps cease : it then only burdens the memory without aiding perspicuity.

The sum is, that the adverb, from its varied character, admits of no rule being given for determining it, except that it comprehends all words which do not obviously belong to one or other of the foregoing parts of speech.

CONCLUSION.

ACCORDING to the preceding arrangement, all confusion may be avoided in determining the parts of speech. Every word is accounted for, its character fixed and unchangeable, and its discovery easy. For every purpose of parsing with facility, the text alone of the Analysis will be found sufficient. But if, in addition, the notes be perused; and the Appendix B, in which the general position is maintained, that “the same word is not more than one part of speech,” I am persuaded that, with the exception of a few solecisms, colloquialisms, and anomalous expressions which are common to all languages, no ambiguity is unaccounted for, nor any real difficulty unexplained.

SPECIMEN OF PARSING,

BEING A

LETTER OF LORD CHESTERFIELD'S TO HIS SON.

PRELIMINARY REMARKS.

1. WHEN a noun occurs in the nominative case, I call it a *noun* simply. The reader who knows the meaning of the word, will easily supply whatever else it may be thought necessary to say concerning it.

2. When an adjective occurs without its noun expressed after it, I always supply the noun, with a view to show that the said adjective is never any other part of speech. I have also supplied the noun, or the adjective and noun, when elliptically omitted after the preposition.

3. As the reader is supposed to know the difference between the present and past participles of verbs, and the nominative and objective case

of pronouns, these, after the first time of occurring, will merely be called *participle* and *pronoun* respectively.

4. When the verb is in any of the persons of the present time, indefinite action, indicative mood, active voice, the infinitive only of the verb will be mentioned, after the first time of occurring, to save the trouble of repetition.

LETTER.

YOUR very bad pronunciation, : Pronominal adjective—adverb—attributive adjective*—noun.

my son, gives me : Pronominal adjective—noun—3d person singular, present time, indefinite action, indicative mood, active voice of the verb *to give*—pronoun, objective case.

real concern, and I : adj.—noun—adv.—pron.

congratulate both you and : 1st pers. sing. present time, indefinite, of verb *to congratulate*—definite adj. (meaning *both persons*)—pron.—adv.

myself that I was : pronom. adj. *my*, compounded with the affix *self* (see p. 21)—def. adj. (on *that account*,

* As the attributive adjectives occur frequently, I shall, in future, to save space, call them simply *adjectives*.

or *that thing* happened, viz.)—pron. 1st pers. sing. past indefinite of verb *to be*.

informed of it, as : past participle of verb *to inform*—preposition—pron.—adv. (“ I was informed,” past indefinite, passive voice, of verb *to inform*).

I hope in time : pron.—verb *to hope*—prep.—noun.

to prevent it, and : infinitive of *to prevent*—pron.—adv.

I shall ever think : pron.—1st pers. sing. indicative auxiliary *shall*—adv.—infinitive of *to think* (see p. 43), (“ I shall think,” future indefinite of *to think*).

myself, as hereafter you : *myself*, see this word above—adv.—adv.—pron.

will, I am sure, : indic. aux. *will*—pron.—verb *to be*—adj. (of *sure belief*).

think yourself infinitively obliged : inf. of *to think*—see *myself* above—adv.—past part. of *to oblige* (“ you will think,” fut. indef. of *to think*).

to your friend for : prep.—pronom. adj.—noun—prep.

informing me of it. : present part. of *to inform*—pron.—prep.—pron.

If this ungraceful and : conjunction—def. adj.—adj.—adv.

disagreeable manner of speaking : adj.—noun—prep.—part. of verb *to speak*.

had, either by your : past indef. of *to have**—adv.—prep.—pronom. adj.

* We need only say here, and in similar cases, that the conjunction *if* throws the verb into the hypoth

negligence or mine, : noun—adv.—pronom. adj. (*mine negligence*.)

become habitual to you, : “ it had become,” past finished of verb *to become*—adj.—prep.—pron.

as in a couple of : adv.—prep.—indef. adj.—noun—prep.

years more it would : noun—adj. (*more time*), comparative degree of *much*—pron.—contingent aux. *would*.

have been, what a figure : inf. of *to have* (see p. 43)—part. of *to be* (“ it would have,” present time, conditional mood of *to have* ; “ it would have been,” past time, cond. of *to be* ; see p. 42)—def. adj. see p. 24—*indef. adj.*—noun.

would you have made : conting. aux. *would*—pron.—inf. of *to have*—part. of *to make* (“ you would have made,” see above, “ it would have been”).

in company or in : prep.—noun—adv.—prep.

a public assembly ! : indef. adj.—adj.—noun.

Who would have liked : pron.—(*i. e.* “ he or they would have liked,” see above, “ it would have been”).

you in the one, or : pron.—prep.—def. adj.—def. adj. (*one state*)—adv.

attended you in the other ? : “ who would have at-

but that there is nothing in the verb itself to distinguish it as such. In parsing, we need not, I think, advert to the said form of the verb, unless it belong to one of the *distinguishing* parts. See p. 44.

- tended," see above, "who would have liked"—pron.—
 prep.—def. adj.—def. adj. (*other state*).
- Read what Cicero and : present imperative of *to read*
 —def. adj. (*what things*)—noun—adv.
- Quintilian say of enunciation, : noun—verb *to say*—
 prep.—noun.
- and observe what stress : adv.—present imper. of *to*
observe—def. adj.—noun.
- they lay upon the gracefulness of it. : pron.—verb
to lay—prep.—def. adj.—noun—prep.—pron.
- Nay, Cicero goes farther, : adv.—noun—verb *to go*
 —adj. (*a farther length*) comparative of *far*.
- and even maintains that : adv.—adv.—verb *to main-*
tain—def. adj. (*that position, viz.*)
- a good figure is : indef. adj.—adj.—noun—verb *to be*.
- necessary for an orator, : adj. (*a necessary thing*)—
 prep.—indef. adj.—noun.
- and particularly that : adv.—adv.—def. adj. (*that po-*
sition, viz.)
- he must not be : pron.—conting. aux. *must*—adv.—
 inf. of *to be* ("he must be," present imper. of *to be*).
- overgrown and clumsy. : adj.—adv.—adj.
- Men are oftener led : noun—verb *to be*—adv. (compar
 of *often*)—part. of *to lead* ("they are led," pres. indef.
 passive of *to lead*).
- by their ears than : prep.—pronom. adj.—noun—adv.
- by their understandings. : prep.—pronom. adj.—
 noun.

The way to the heart : def. adj.—noun—prep.—def.
—def. adj.—noun.

is through the senses. : verb *to be*—prep.—def. adj.—
noun.

I have frequently known : pron.—verb *to have*—adv.
—part. of *to know* (“ I have known,” present finished
of *to know*).

a man's fortune decided : indef. adj.—noun, posses-
sive case—noun—part. of *to decide*.

for ever by his first address. : “ for ever,” an adv.*
—prep.—pronom. adj.—def. adj.—noun.

If it be pleasing, : conj.—pron.—present hypothetical
form of *to be*, see p. 44—part. of *to please*.

people are hurried involuntarily : noun—verb *to be*
—part. of *to hurry*—adv. (“ they are hurried,” see “ they
are led” above.)

into a persuasion that : prep.—indef. adj.—noun—
def. adj. (of *that fact*, viz.)

he has merit ; if it be : pron.—verb *to have*—noun—
see “ if it be,” above.

ungraceful, they are immediately : adj.—pron.—
verb *to be*—adv.

prejudiced against him, and : part. of *to prejudice*—
prep.—pron.—adv. (“ they are prejudiced,” see “ they
are led,” above).

* The words “ for ever” should be joined, like *for-sooth*,
for-as-much, &c. They are probably an abbreviation for
“ for every time.”

unwilling to allow him : compounded present part., see
p. 51—inf. of *to allow*—pron.

the merit which : def. adj.—noun—def. adj. (*which merit*).

it may be he has. : pron.—conting. aux. *may*—inf. of
to be—pron.—verb *to have*. (“ it may be,” pres. poten.
of *to be*.)

Nor is this statement : adv.—verb *to be*—def. adj.—
noun.

so unjust as at : adv.—adj.—adv.—prep.

first sight it may seem; : def. adj.—noun—pron.—con-
ting. aux. *may*—inf. of *to seem* (“ it may seem,” pres.
poten. of *to seem*).

for, if a man : prep. (*for the following reason*)—conj.—
indef. adj.—noun.

have parts, he must : pres. hypoth. form of *to have*—
noun—pron.—conting. aux. *must*.

know of how much : inf. of *to know*—prep.—adv.—
adj.—(“ he must know,” pres. imper. of *to know*).

consequence it is to him : noun—pron.—verb *to be*—
prep.—pron.

to have a graceful : inf. of *to have*—indef. adj.—adj.

manner of speaking, and : noun—prep.—part. of *to speak*—adv.

a genteel and pleasing address; : indef. adj.—adj.—
adv.—part. of *to please*—noun. See p. 29.

and he will cultivate : adv.—pron.—indic. aux. *will*—

inf. of to cultivate ("he will cultivate," fut. indef. of *to cultivate*).

and improve them to the utmost : adv.—("he will improve," see "he will cultivate" above)—pron.—prep.—def. adj.—adj. (*utmost extent*).

What is the constant observation : def. adj. (*what observation*)—verb *to be*—def. adj.—adj.—noun.

as to all actors : adv.—prep.—def. adj.—noun.

upon the stage? is it : prep.—def. adj.—noun—verb *to be*—pron.

not that those who : adv.—def. adj. (*that observation*)—def. adj. (*those actors*)—pron.

have the best sense : verb *to have*—def. adj.—adj. (*superlative of good*)—noun.

always speak the best, : adv.—verb *to speak*—def. adj.—adj. (*the best way, or in the best manner*).

though they happen not : conj.—pron.—pres. indef. of *to happen*—adv.

to have the best voices? : verb *to have*—def. adj.—adj.—noun.

They will speak distinctly : "they will speak," see "he will cultivate" above—adv.

and with a proper emphasis, : adv.—prep.—indef. adj.—adj.—noun.

be their voices : (*i. e.* though they be) pres. hypoth. form of *to be*—pronom. adj.—noun.

ever so bad. : adv.—adv.—adj.

Had Roscius spoken : past. indef. of *to have*—noun—

part. of *to speak* ("he had spoken," past finished of *to speak*).

quick and ungracefully, I will : adj. (in a *quick manner*)—adv.—adv.—pron.—indic. aux. *will*.

answer for it that Cicero : "I will answer," see "he will cultivate" above—prep.—pron.—def. adj. (*that thing would have happened*)—noun.

would not have thought : see "you would have made" above.

him worth the oration which : pron.—anomalous participle, see p. 51—def. adj.—noun—def. adj. (*which oration*).

he made in his favour. : past indef. of *to make*—prep.—pronom. adj.—noun.

Words were given us : noun—past indef. of *to be*—part. of *to give*—pron. ("they were given," past indef. passive of *to give*).

to communicate our ideas by ; : inf. of *to communicate*—pronom. adj.—noun—prep. (i. e. *by which words*).

and there must be something : adv.—adv.—"it must be," see "he must know" above—adv.

inconceivably absurd in uttering : adv.—adj. (i. e. *an absurd thing*)—prep—part of *to utter*.

them in such a manner : pron.—prep.—indef. adj.—indef. adj. see p. 24.—noun.

as that people either : adv.—def. adj. (*that thing may happen*)—noun—adv.

cannot understand them : conting. aux. *can* combined with the adverb *not*—inf. of *to understand*—pron.— (“ they can understand,” pres. poten. of *to understand*).

or will not desire : adv.—see “ he will cultivate” above.
to understand them. : inf. of *to understand*—pron.

I tell you sincerely that : pron.—verb *to tell*—pron.—adv.—def. adj. (*that truth*).

I shall judge of your parts : “ I shall judge,” see “ he will cultivate”—prep.—pronom. adj.—noun.

by your speaking gracefully or ungracefully. : prep.—pronom. adj.—part. of *to speak*—adv.—adv.—adv.

If you have parts, : conj.—pron.—verb *to have*—noun.
you will never be at rest : * “ you will be,” see “ he will cultivate” above—adv.—prep.—noun.

till you have brought : conj.—pron.—verb *to have*—part. of *to bring*— (“ you have brought” pres. finished of *to bring*).

yourself to a habit : see *myself* above—prep.—indef. adj.—noun.

of speaking most gracefully ; : prep.—part. of *to speak*—adj. (superl. of *much*)—adv. (“ most gracefully” superl. of adv. *gracefully*).

for, I aver that : prep. (*for this reason*)—pron.—verb *to aver*—def. adj. (*that truth*).

* Such expressions as, at rest, at first, at length, at all, in order, in short, &c., may be considered *adverbial* ; at the same time it is always useful to analyze them.

it is in your power. : pron.—verb *to be*—prep.—pron.
nom. adj.—noun.

You will desire your : see “he will cultivate” above—
pronom. adj.

tutor that you may : noun—def. adj. (*that favour*)—
pron.—conting. aux. may.

read aloud to him : “you may read,” see “it may
seem” above—adv.—prep.—pron.

every day, and that : def. adj.—noun—adv.—def. adj.
(*that favour*).

he will correct you : see “he will cultivate” above—
pron.

every time you read : def. adj.—noun—pron.—verb
to read.

too fast, do not observe : adv.—adj. (*with too fast an
utterance**)—verb *to do*—adv.—inf. of *to observe* (“you
do observe,” pres. indef. of *to observe*).

the proper stops, or : def. adj.—adj.—noun—adv.

lay a wrong emphasis. : verb *to lay*—indef. adj.—adj.
noun.

You will even read loud : see “he will cultivate”
above—adv.—adj. (*with a loud voice*).

to yourself, and tune your : prep.—see *myself* above
—adv.—“you will tune” see above—pronom. adj.

* The intervention of the indefinite adjective *a* between an attributive adjective and a noun, does not affect the character of the former; we say “*as tall a man*,” “*too large a house*.”

utterance to your own : noun.—prep.—pronom. adj.—
def. adj.

ear, and read at first : noun.—adv.—“ you will read;”
see above—prep.—def. adj. (*the first time*).

much slower than you need : adj.—adj. (*slower man-
ner*), compar. of *slow*—adv.—pron.—verb *to need*.

to do, in order to correct : inf. of *to do*—prep.—noun
—inf. of *to correct*.

that shameful habit of : def. adj.—adj.—noun—
prep.

speaking faster than you ought. : part. of *to speak*—
adj. (in a *faster manner*)—adv.—conting. aux. *ought*
 (“ you ought to speak,” present incumbent of *to*
speak).

In short, you will make : prep.—adj. (in a *short sen-
tence*)—“ you will make,” see above.

it your business and : pron.—pronom. adj.—noun—
adv.

your pleasure to speak well, : pronom. adj.—noun—
inf. of *to speak*—adv.

if you think right. : conj.—pron.—verb *to think*—adj.
(in a *right manner*).

Therefore what I have said : adv.—def. adj. (what
matter or advice)—see “ you have brought” above.

is more than sufficient, : verb *to be*—adj. (*more mat-
ter*)—adv.—adj. (*sufficient matter*).

if you have sense, : conj.—pron.—verb *to have*—
noun.

and ten times more : adv.—def. adj.—noun—adj.

(*more matter*).

would not be sufficient, : see “would not have” above
—adj. (*sufficient matter*).

if you have not. : conj.—pron.—verb *to have*—adv.

So here I rest it. : adv.—adv.—pron.—verb *to rest*—
pron.

APPENDIX.

A.

THE PRESENT UNSETTLED STATE OF THE ENGLISH PARTS OF SPEECH.

THIS in part appears from the same word being denominated three and four different parts of speech, according to its apparent use—a subject which is elsewhere fully discussed.*

The same fact appears from the numerous opinions as to the number of cases belonging to our nouns. Besides those I have already mentioned (Analysis, p. 18), I may add, that Drs Johnson and Blair express *doubt* whether our nouns have a possessive case or not. The former says, "The relation of English nouns to words going before them or following, are not expressed by *cases*, or changes of termination, but, as in most of the European languages, by prepositions,—*unless we may be said to have a genitive.*" The latter remarks, "English nouns have no case whatever, except a *sort of genitive.*"†

* See Appendix B.

† This may be a proper place to remark on what seems, at first sight, a double genitive. In such phrases as these,

I have briefly adverted in another place (Analysis, p. 42) to the uncertainty which prevails in our grammars concerning the Auxiliary Verbs, particularly those from which we form our Contingent Moods. Of these, Cobbett says, "I need not dwell here on the uses of *shall*, *will*, *may*, *might*, *should*, *would*, *can*, *could*, and *must*, which uses, various as they are, are as well known to us all, as the uses of our *teeth* and our *noses*; and to misapply which words, argues not only a deficiency in the reasoning faculties, but almost a deficiency in intellectual discrimination." This is one way of getting rid of difficulties. That very part of grammar which has been more misunderstood than perhaps any other, and which, therefore, needed most explanation,

"How many servants of my Father's have bread enough and to spare," &c., "In a letter of Lord Chesterfield's to his Son," &c., the question is, what noun is understood after Father's and Chesterfield's? At one time I was disposed to think this phraseology corrupt, and that the 's in Father's and Chesterfield's ought to be dropped. But on farther consideration, I am satisfied that the above sentences are merely elliptical; thus, "How many servants (out) of (or among) my Father's (*servants*) have bread enough." "In a letter (out) of (or among) Chesterfield's (*letters*) to his Son."

It is a curious coincidence, and not unworthy of observation, that in old writings the third person singular, present time indefinite of verbs, the plurals of nouns, and their possessive cases, all end alike, viz. in *is*. The following extract from an old "Bond of Manrent" will exemplify what I have just stated:—"And I sall give the said Lord my maister, the best liell and trew counsaile that I can quhen he only *askis* at me; and do him trew and thankful service, in all and sundry his *actionis*, *causis*, and *quarrellis*, movit, or to be movit be him; my allegeant to owre soovran ladye the *quenis* grace, her tutor and governor, allanerly except."

Cobbett takes for granted his plough-boys and apprentices comprehend as well as they do the use of their teeth and their noses! Might he not have made the same supposition concerning every part of grammar, and thus saved himself the trouble of writing a book upon the subject? He might have said at once, "whoever does not understand the rules of Syntax, and the definitions and uses of the different parts of speech, must be deficient in intellectual discrimination."

This grammarian seems to have a strange antipathy to the auxiliary verbs being considered as the *moods* of the regular verbs (which yet are the only moods they have), though he gives no reason for this antipathy. He says, "all the *fuss* which grammarians have made about the potential moods, *and other fanciful distinctions of the kind*, serve only to puzzle and perplex the reader!" Cobbett appears to have been himself sadly perplexed by these same moods, and, therefore, he very naturally decries what he did not understand: and yet, such is his inconsistency, that in the passage quoted above, he assumes that his sailors and soldiers, &c., already understand this perplexing subject too well to render any explanation necessary!

But, besides the auxiliary verbs, it will be found that the utmost confusion prevails with regard to the Preposition, Conjunction and Adverb, of which the very names are calculated to mislead. In fact, the names Adjective, Preposition, Conjunction, and Adverb, have so little to do with the parts of speech which they are employed to designate, that, had all these four reciprocally interchanged places, they would have equally served the purpose which they do at present. But in an age when there is so laudable an anxiety shown to furnish correct nomenclatures for subjects of science, why should grammar

be almost the only one which is, in this respect, neglected?

L. Murray defines a Preposition as that which serves to "connect words with one another, and to show the relation between them." But is not this equally true of the Noun, Adjective, Pronoun, Verb, Conjunction, and Adverb? Have not *all* these a mutual relation and connexion when put together, so as to form a sentence? And if so, L. Murray has done no more than ascribe to the preposition a property which it possesses in common with every other part of speech; and consequently has not defined it at all.

Equally unmeaning and puerile is his account of the Conjunction, which he tells us is "chiefly used to connect sentences;" but he adds, "it sometimes connects only words." A man must have more than common penetration, who can form the most remote idea of a preposition or conjunction from such definitions.

Cobbett rids his hands of this matter much in the same way that he does of the auxiliary verbs. He devotes only *three pages* of his whole book on grammar to prepositions and conjunctions, which might indeed have been enough, had he said any thing concerning them to the purpose; but he does no more than respect the errors of his predecessors; and excuses himself from not doing more, on the plea that the words in question are only "the little fingers of the body," and unworthy of much consideration!

The writer of the article "Grammar," in the *Encyclopedia Britannica*, thus expresses himself on the same two parts of speech:—"We shall content ourselves with retailing the common doctrine respecting these parts of speech, *as far as it is intelligible*; requesting our readers who would understand the subject, to attend rather to *the relations between their various ideas* (this, by the way, is a new method of

finding out the parts of speech) than to *the frivolous distinctions, which, in compliance with custom, we are compelled to lay before them.*" What an admission to be made in England in the nineteenth century, and on the subject of English Grammar! Is it not full time that *some* attempt should be made to disentangle a subject which is confessedly involved in so much confusion?

The celebrated Harris defines prepositions and conjunctions to be "words void of signification; but so formed as to unite words that are significant, and that would not otherwise unite." This position carries its refutation on its face. It is absurd to suppose that any words are void of signification, however ignorant we may be what that signification is: and it is still more absurd to suppose that two words, each confessedly signifying *something* when taken apart, should be combined, and have a new meaning communicated to them by a word signifying *nothing*.

A respectable grammarian of the name of Grant, says of prepositions and conjunctions, "both parts of speech being grammatical connectives, it is not always easy to discriminate them."

But the circumstance which, more than any other, proves the unsettled state of these two parts of speech is, that their exact number has never yet been determined—in other words, no precise rule for ascertaining them has hitherto been discovered. The grammarians content themselves with giving us what they call the *principal* ones; or they furnish eight or ten of them, and then finish with an *et cætera*!

Even H. Tooke did not perceive any other difference between the two, than that prepositions were applied to *words*, and conjunctions to *sentences*. This is, no doubt, true generally, though not invariably; but even if it were, it is much too vag-

serve as a rule for distinguishing between them. It is necessary to know to what kind of words the one is applied, and to what kind of sentences the other. Tooke, however, did not give his attention to the parts of speech *as such*. He was content to take these as he found them, and confined himself to the derivation of the words.

A writer on grammar calls *Adverbs* "the modifications of the attributes of substances;" an explanation which may be very profound, but is not very intelligible. But whatever it may mean, it cannot be true, since no one explanation or definition will apply to so multifarious a class of words as adverbs.

S. Johnson, in his "Grammar of the English Tongue," prefixed to his Dictionary, unaccountable as it may seem, does not so much as mention prepositions, conjunctions, or adverbs!

Mr Fearn, the author of a book entitled *Anti-Tooke*, speaks so abstractedly and obscurely on the subject of grammar, that I have found it impossible to understand him. He ascribes all the errors of his predecessors to their "ignorance of the real structure of the category of relatives and relation." The phrase "I love," he would change into "I innung a loving state;" "I have loved," into "I have *love*;" "I had loved," into "I have-have (or ha-have) loved." Lastly, he promises, that, in a second volume (which I have not seen), he will treat "of the nature of limited silence, and grammatical contact, considered as an element of speech"!

There are four ways of disposing of a subject, when we are too dull to understand it, and too conceited to acknowledge that such is the case—all of which seem to be in vogue among our grammarians.

The *first* is, to affect to despise the subject as unworthy of attention: the *second* is, to express ourselves upon it unintelligibly or obscurely: the *third* is, to assert boldly that it is too simple to need any

explanation, and that a man must be a fool who does not intuitively comprehend it : and the *fourth* is, to say nothing at all about it, one way or the other.

As a farther proof of the unsettled state of the parts of speech, it may be mentioned, that, upon a comparison of Johnson's and Walker's Dictionaries, it will be found that many words which the former calls adverbs, the latter calls conjunctions.

The Encyclopedia Britannica says of Adverbs that " they are applied to many purposes, and their general nature may be better understood by reading a list of them, and attending to their etymology, than by any general description or definition."

A posthumous work by the Rev. Dr A. Murray of Edinburgh, on the History of European languages, was published a few years ago, and contains occasional remarks on grammar. I never met, in any book, with more gratuitous, and, I will add, more improbable assertion. The editor (the Rev. Dr Scott) says of Dr Murray, " He is an expounder of languages on the principles of Horne Tooke, and only entered on the path which that ingenious philologist opened up." No two works on the same subject, were ever, I will venture to say, more opposite in principle than the Diversions of Purley and the History of European languages. Dr Murray thinks, and *attempts* to prove, that all the known languages of Europe and Asia are derived from nine monosyllables, viz. ag, bag, dwag, gwag, lag, mag, nag, rag, and swag ! It is but justice, however, to the author to add, that the work evidently was not intended for the public in its present state, which is ill arranged, and in many parts unintelligible.

For the exposure of Mr Harris' numerous errors and inconsistencies, I must refer the reader to the Diversions of Purley, where (vol. 1, p. 300) will find a number of additional ex-

from our own and foreign authors, of the truth of the position under consideration. The few I have given are chiefly taken from those English writers who have appeared since Tooke's time, and whose works happened to fall in my way.

All this seems to prove the present unsettled state of our parts of speech ; and that no rules have hitherto been invented, calculated to fix their character, and determine them with certainty. I hope those I have given will be found to answer this important end ; particularly with respect to the pronoun, preposition, conjunction, and adverb, which appeared to stand most in need of illustration. Whatever objection my rules may be liable to, they seem preferable to the total absence of rule. Even arbitrary power is better than anarchy.

B.

THE SAME WORD IS NOT MORE THAN ONE PART OF SPEECH.—In this appendix it is shown that the word **THAT** is always a definite adjective, having a noun expressed or understood after it.

“I do not allow,” says Tooke, “that any words change their nature so as to belong, sometimes to one part of speech, sometimes to another, from the different ways of using them. I never could perceive any such fluctuation in any word whatever, though I know it is a general charge brought erroneously against words of almost every denomination.”

Neither Tooke, however, nor any other author that I have met with, has undertaken to *make good* the position, that the same word is only one part of speech.

By the doctrine thus stated, it is not to be understood that a word may not be a noun or a verb, according as the indefinite adjective *a*, or the sign of the infinitive *to*, may be put before it ; thus, *to fight*, *to run*, *to walk*, are verbs ; *a fight*, *a run*, *a walk*, are nouns. These are rather to be considered as different words, than as examples of the same word being different parts of speech.

Nor is it to be understood as a departure from the position under consideration, that the same word is sometimes, apparently, both a noun and an adjective ; as, under the head of the adjective, I have shown that all such instances are merely nouns used adjectively ; any noun being liable to be so used.*

There are, however, few rules without exception ;

* See Analysis, p. 17.

and, in ordinary books on grammar, we find more exceptions to general rules than, perhaps, in any other science whatever. Yet I have scarcely had occasion to make one exception to the rules of my Analysis ; for which reason I am the less scrupulous in offering one or two to the general position which I have undertaken to establish in this Appendix.

I have already remarked, under the head of the preposition, that the word *but* is both a preposition and an adverb, according to its meaning ; or, to speak more grammatically, according as it governs, or does not govern, the objective case of the pronoun. The word *her*, it may be added, is both a pronominal adjective, and the objective case of the pronoun *she*. The only other exception I am aware of is the following :—many present participles of verbs are, at the same time, nouns ; as, *great learning*, *good eating*, *hard drinking*. Some of these admit of plural terminations, which is another proof of their being nouns ; as, *excellent understandings*, *acute feelings*, *angelic beings*, *clever sayings*, *fine doings*, &c. &c. Such words consequently (when in the singular number) are either present participles or nouns, according to their use and signification.

The great error of our modern lexicographers and grammarians, has been in doubling, tripling, and quadrupling the parts of speech of those adjectives and prepositions which are used *apparently* as adverbs, pronouns, or conjunctions.

Whenever adjectives occur in sentences without any noun expressed or obviously understood after them, they are most improperly called adverbs. But it should be remembered that when it can be shown, by a few plain examples, that a word is an adjective (which may be done by trying if a noun can be placed after it*) it is a legitimate inference

* See Analysis, p. 14.

that the word is *always* an adjective, though no noun may be expressed after it, and though it may even be doubtful *what* noun is to be understood ; and a word is never to be called an adverb, till it be found impossible to refer it to any of the preceding parts of speech. Thus, in the colloquial phrases, as *much* as, as *good* as, in *short*, in *general*, upon the *whole*, at *least*, it is *enough*, I shall expect you *early*, *only* be *sure* you come, &c. ; much, good, short, general, whole, best, enough, early, only, and sure, are adjectives and nothing else ; because, taking them in their ordinary sense, unconnected with particular sentences, they may be made to precede and designate nouns. The foregoing and similar phrases are mere abbreviations : and the reason why they are so, is because we are continually using them, and wish to convey our meaning in the most expeditious manner possible. They are, as it were, the short-hand of conversation,—sentences nearly worn away by constant use and friction ; or, to change the figure, they are by-paths and near-cuts to the object in view, to save the time and trouble of following the more circuitous high-way. “Almost all the irregularities in the construction of any language,” says Priestley, “arise from the *ellipsis* of some words which were originally inserted in the sentence and made it regular.” But it seems evident that the ellipsis cannot, or at least ought not to alter the original parts of speech of the words. At the same time, when we set about the task of showing that the foregoing words still retain their character of adjectives, it must be acknowledged that this brevity sometimes produces obscurity ; and that what we gain in respect to time and despatch, we are apt to lose in perspicuity. For the said adjectives have long ceased to be used in connexion with their nouns ; and we cannot now revert to the period when they came to be thus elliptically used, or tra

the precise association which must have existed in the speaker's mind; and hence there is occasionally a difficulty in determining what is the exact noun to be supplied after them. But it is not less certain that *some* noun is to be supplied, and that is reason enough for calling the words in question adjectives, and not adverbs.

In proof of this, I may offer the following solutions of the above-mentioned sentences:—

In *short*, *i. e.* (to say all) in (a) short (sentence).

In *general*, *i. e.* in (a) general (way).

Upon the *whole*, *i. e.* upon (a review of) the whole (matter).

At *least*, *i. e.* at (the) least (estimate or consideration).

It is *enough*, *i. e.* enough (food, discourse, reward, punishment, or whatever else may chance to be referred to by the speaker).

I shall expect you *early*, *i. e.* at an early (hour).

Only be *sure* you come, *i. e.* (the) only (thing is) be (a) sure (person, or in a sure state that) you come. In the same manner we say, elliptically, be quick, be good, be constant, where quick, good, and constant are evidently adjectives.

The words much, more, most, little, less, least, (each of which, according to Johnson, is *three* parts of speech) may, in like manner, be shown never to lose their original character of adjectives, though often used elliptically.

In the familiar sentence, *e. g.* "I am much obliged to you," the question is, what noun is to be understood after the adjective MUCH? I have no doubt it is *obligation* or *gratitude*, or some noun of similar import; thus, "I am (with) much (obligation or gratitude) obliged to you;" though, of course, the noun is dropped to prevent tautology. But in our Bible translation, many such tautological phrases may be found, which is a proof that about the time

the said translation was made, tautology was not thought so great a blemish as it is now, and which renders it probable that such sentences as the above, are to be filled up in the manner I am contending for. The following are a few scriptural tautological expressions that occur to me:—"He will *rejoice* over thee with *joy*;" "he *cried* with a bitter *cry*;" "with *sorrow* he hath *afflicted* me;" "*strengthened* with *might* in the inner man;" "*filled* with all the *fulness* of God;" "the *comfort* wherewith we are *comforted*;" "I will command the clouds that they *rain* no *rain* upon it."

According to this rule, we need have no difficulty in filling up many sentences in which such adjectives as *much* seem to be used adverbially; thus, "I like him *much*," i. e. I like him (with) much (love); "I am *much* delighted with him," i. e. I am (with) much (pleasure, delight, or satisfaction,) delighted with him.

Other uses of *much* are still more easily reduced to the same rule;—"where *much* is given, *much* will be required," i. e. where much (talent) is given, much (return) will be required; "*much* larger" means, larger (by) much (space or extent); "are ye not *much* better than they?" i. e. better (by) much (measure), or in a much (better state), or much better (creatures) than they.

MORE.—"It is *more* blessed to give than to receive," i. e. a more blessed (thing).

"He loved Rachael *more* than Leah," i. e. with more (affection).

"As the sun sinks, the stars appear *more* and *more*," i. e. with more and more (distinctness).

"The dove returned not again unto him any *more*," i. e. any more (times).

"Jane dances *more* gracefully than Mary." Here, to determine the noun understood after the comparative adjective *more*, we must bear in mind that the

E

termination *ly* is a contraction for *like*; and hence the true rendering is, "Jane dances more graceful-like than Mary," *i. e.* in a more graceful-like (manner) than Mary.

MOST.—"Anne dances the *most* gracefully of the three," *i. e.* in the most graceful-like (manner) of the three.

"He will love *most* who has *most* forgiven," *i. e.* he will love with most (affection) who has most (debt) forgiven.

"Sorrowing *most* of *all* for the words which he spake," &c., *i. e.* sorrowing with most (sorrow) of all (causes of sorrow) for the words which he spake, &c.

"A penurious man makes the *most* of what he has," *i. e.* the most (use or value).

LITTLE.—"When thou wast *little* in thine own sight," *i. e.* of little (consideration) or a little (person).

"He finished it by *little* and *little*," *i. e.* by little and little (degrees or steps).

"If that had been too *little* for thee," *i. e.* too little (a matter) or too little (happiness) for thee.

"He has *little* of this world's goods," *i. e.* little (portion) of this world's goods.

"He is a *little* better to-day," *i. e.* in a little better (state).

LESS.—"Tis *less* to conquer than to make wars cease," *i. e.* of less (consequence) or a less (matter).

"Thy servant knew nothing of this, *less* or *more*," *i. e.* with more or less (knowledge).

"The English are *less* volatile than the French," *i. e.* a less volatile (people).

"I saw him *less* and *less* after that," *i. e.* a less and less (number of times).

LEAST.—The only doubtful instance in which this word is used is in the common phrase "at least," which has been already explained, page 96.

These examples may suffice to satisfy the reader that the above adjectives never lose their original

character, however used, or wherever situated. Some of the proposed methods of filling up the sentences, may perhaps appear awkward ; but this proceeds solely from our habit of contracting our colloquial phrases, and from being more anxious to express ourselves with rapidity than with accuracy.* It is to be observed, at the same time, that this habit of abbreviating is not without its advantages, notwithstanding the awkwardness and ambiguity it sometimes occasions. "Abbreviations," says Tooke, "are the wheels of language, the wings of Mercury, and though we might be dragged along without them, it would be with difficulty, very heavily and tediously." To be convinced of the truth of this, we have only to examine a Law Instrument, where uncommon accuracy is required. It abounds with tautological expressions and tedious repetitions, which are necessary to prevent the possibility of mistake, but of all which we get rid by certain conventional abbreviations.

* "L'esprit humain," says M. de Brosses, "veut aller vite dans son opération, plus empressé de s'exprimer promptement, que curieux de s'exprimer avec une justesse exacte et réfléchie. S'il n'a pas l'instrument qu'il foudroit employer, il se sert de celui qu'il a tout prêt."

Almost every verse of our English translation of the Scriptures furnishes us with an example of an elliptical sentence. It is well known that the words in italics are inserted to supply the ellipses of the Hebrew and Greek originals.

Syllables are omitted in words, for the same reason that words are omitted in sentences, viz., that the mind may "aller vite dans son opération." Some remarkable instances might be given how much the French have curtailed the words they have borrowed from the Latin. The following are a few :—*Même*, meipsum ; *evêque*, episcopus ; *carême*, quadragesima ; *ami*, amicus ; *âme*, animus ; *vingt*, viginti ; *prêcher*, prædicare ; *maître*, magister ; *envie*, invidia ; *blâme*, blasphemia.

Let us take another example of an adjective being confounded with other parts of speech. It might be reasonably supposed that the word *ONE* would be (without a pun) only *one* part of speech, and have only *one* meaning;—according to Johnson, however, it has *six* meanings as an *adjective*, and *thirteen* as a *noun*! And to increase the confusion, he adds, “There are many uses of the word *one* which serve to denominate it a substantive, though some of them may *seem* rather to make it a *pronoun relative*, and some may *perhaps* be considered as consistent with the nature of an adjective, the substantive being understood”! I have looked carefully over the examples he quotes, and find that the word is invariably an adjective, having a noun expressed or understood after it. I will give a few examples of what Johnson calls its use as a noun, with a view to show that it is never any thing but an adjective:—

“The trees beat *one* against another,” *i. e.* one (tree) against another (tree).

“The men were taken out *one* by *one*,” *i. e.* one (man), by one (man).

“*One* o’clock,” *i. e.* one (hour) of the clock.

“*One* would imagine,” *i. e.* one (person) would imagine.

“That orange is bad, give me a better *one*,” *i. e.* a better one (orange), or one better orange.

“Let us love *one* another,” *i. e.* let us each one (person) love another (person).

One’s is evidently a contraction for one person’s.

It thus appears that in all the foregoing elliptical sentences, nouns are understood after the words we have been considering, which words consequently are adjectives.* It is surely better to have recourse

* I know of only one *apparent* exception to the rule, that words which precede and designate nouns are adjectives.—we say, “*either house* will suit me,” “*neither horse*

to this method of explaining the apparent ambiguity, than admit a position so repugnant to common sense, and so subversive of all order, as that the same word may be several different parts of speech.

It were easy to prove, by the very same method, that such words as *this*, *that*, *which*, *what*, *these*, *those*, *such*, *each*, *another*, &c., which Johnson and others call *pronouns*, and I know not what besides, are never any thing but adjectives, on the ground that they precede and designate nouns, which no pronoun can do. A pronoun is the representative of its noun, as an ambassador is the representative of his sovereign at a distant court. An adjective is the herald which precedes and designates the sovereign in his own court; but we must not confound the herald at home with the ambassador abroad. Their characters, situations, and offices, are essentially different.

The only one of the above class of adjectives which requires a separate notice is *THAT*. Johnson

can carry me;" from which it might be concluded that *either* and *neither* were adjectives. If, however, we analyze these sentences, we shall find that they are mere abbreviations. "*Either* house," means (and is a contraction for) "*either* this house or that house." If then we call *either* an adjective, it will be impossible to avoid calling *or* an adjective also, which would clearly be absurd. Hence we must call them both *adverbs*; and it is observable that in other languages, *either* and *or* are expressed by one and the same word, as indeed is done by our poets in our own; thus,

Or in the starry regions *or* the abyss.

Neither is "not *either*," and therefore the same remark applies equally to the latter as to the former; hence also we have,

We *nor* ally *nor* brother know.

Either is often improperly put for *each*; as, "on *either* side of the river was there the tree of life."

calls this word a pronoun and a conjunction ; and Murray, Cobbett, and the rest of the grammarians, say it is a relative pronoun, a demonstrative pronoun, and a conjunction ! That it cannot be a pronoun of any kind, the foregoing remarks will I hope satisfy the reader ;* and I will now proceed to show, by a few examples, that its supposed use as a conjunction, may always (by supplying the understood noun) be resolved into its real use as an adjective :—

“We believe *that* thou shalt come to be our judge ;”
i. e. we believe that (truth), thou shalt come to be our Judge.

“Thou sayest *that* I am ;” i. e. thou sayest that (person) I am.

“I tell you *that* that man is innocent ;” i. e. I tell you that (fact), that man is innocent.

“Read the book again *that* you may understand it better ;” i. e. read the book again (to the end) that (or to that end) you may understand it better.

“They glorified God, saying *that* a great prophet is risen up among us ;” i. e. saying that (speech, or making that declaration) a great prophet is risen up among us.

“We give thee thanks for *that* it hath pleased thee,” &c. ; i. e. we give thee thanks for that (circumstance, namely,) it hath pleased thee, &c. In such examples, the *for* is commonly omitted ; but its insertion here is grammatically correct ; and it affords us a good instance of the manner in which expressions come to be gradually abbreviated, and abbreviated in such a way, that their original connexion is not always easily discovered.

“So run *that* ye may obtain ;” i. e. so run that (result may happen, or to that end)—ye may obtain.

“Eat *that* you may live, and live *that* you may

See Analysis, p. 19.

do good ;" *i. e.* eat to that (end)—you may live, and live to that (end)—you may do good.

"The first particular to be observed concerning Cain and Abel is this, *that* they engaged in different employments suitable to their different inclinations ;" *i. e.* is this (circumstance, namely,) that (circumstance)—they engaged in different employments, &c. Here we have, no doubt, an instance of redundancy, but by no means an inelegant one ; and it is of use in more particularly calling the attention of the reader to the subject about to be mentioned.

In all these examples the word *that* is clearly an adjective ; and we may add, that were its full *pronunciation* attended to, and also its correct *punctuation* (namely with a comma or dash after it), we should have less difficulty than we now have in perceiving that such is the case.

But there is another common use of the same word, where its employment as an adjective is less obvious, but not less certain : I mean, where it is substituted for *who* and *which*.

"Blessed is he *that* hath not walked in the counsel of the ungodly ;" in other words, "blessed is *the man* that hath not walked in the counsel of the ungodly ;" *i. e.* blessed is the man that (man) hath not walked in the counsel of the ungodly. That this is the true sense of *that*, will appear more evident by inverting the order of the words : "The man hath not walked in the counsel of the ungodly—blessed is that man ;" which order of the words brings the sentence close to the etymology of *the* and *that*. For according to what has been already shown,* *the* means assume, or suppose ; and *that*, assumed, or supposed. Hence we have, by substi-

* Analysis, Note, p. 22.

tution—*Suppose* a man hath not walked in the counsel of the ungodly ; blessed is *supposed* man.

“ He shall be like a tree *that* will bring forth his fruit in due season ;” i. e. he shall be like a tree that (tree) will bring forth his fruit in due season. If *which* be substituted for *that*, it will clearly be “ which tree ;” and for the same reason it must be “ that tree.”

Examples might be multiplied *ad infinitum* ; “ And why beholdest thou the mote that (mote) is in thy brother’s eye, and considerest not the beam that (beam) is in thine own eye ?”

But this is not all : for as the adjective *that* signifies *assumed*, and as we may put a plural noun after the latter, and say “ assumed persons or things,” so we may say “ that persons or things.” This may startle those readers who have not attended to the origin and progress of the English language. But nothing is more true than what I have stated. The placing plural nouns after *that*, was a general rule of syntax down to the reign of Henry VIII.,* and though few are aware of it, it is *still* practised every day by ourselves, whenever *that* is used for *who* or *which*, the antecedent noun being in the plural number ; thus,—“ to render thanks for the great benefits *that* we have received at his hands ;” i. e. to render thanks for the great benefits that (benefits) we have received at his hands. This may be proved in two ways ; 1st, by referring, as before, to the etymology of *the* and *that*—“ *assume* great benefits ; *assumed* benefits we have received at his hands.” Or, 2d, by substituting *which* for *that*—“ the great benefits which (benefits) we have received at his hands.”

“ As we forgive them (or those persons) *that*

* Sir Thomas More says,—“ That evyll aungells the devilles.”

trespass against us ;" *i. e.* as we forgive those persons that (persons) trespass against us.

"Mercifully assist our prayers *that* we make before thee ;" *i. e.* that (prayers) we make before thee.

Let one example more suffice : " And they brought unto him those which (*i. e.* those persons, which persons) were possessed with devils, and those that (*i. e.* those persons, that persons) had the dropsy, and he healed them."

The above instances include every possible variety of the use of *that* ; and the conclusion to be drawn from the whole is this—the word *that* has always a noun after it, singular or plural, expressed or understood ; consequently, it is always a definite adjective, and never, therefore, a pronoun or a conjunction.*

Out of the thirty-seven prepositions, which I have enumerated in their proper place, eighteen of them, according to Johnson, are *adverbs* as well as prepositions ! I consider it of so much importance to get rid of this confusion of speech, that I hope the reader will bear with me, while I show, very briefly, that the eighteen words alluded to are prepositions *only* ; it being remembered that the primary characteristic of the preposition is to affect nouns, adjectives, pronouns, and participles ; and, in particular, that it governs the objective case of the pronoun.

In the following sentences, the prepositions do not appear, at first sight, to affect the said parts of speech, and hence they have been called *adverbs*. By supplying the ellipsis, however, it will appear

* The several uses of *that* may be reduced to *four*, when the noun is understood ; and it may be added, that the first, second, and third time it occurs in the fourth commandment, and the single time in which it occurs in the fifth commandment, exhibit the said four uses of the word.

that they are thereby restored to their original and unchangeable character of prepositions only.

ABOVE and AROUND.—“ *Above* was sky, and ocean all *around* ;” *i. e.* above* (them) and around (them).

ABOUT.—“ Why go ye *about* to kill me ?” *i. e.* about (preparing) to kill me—actually employed in preparing.

AFTER.—“ And about the space of an hour *after* ;” *i. e.* after (that time).

BENEATH.—“ The Lord he is God in heaven *above*, and in the earth *beneath* ;” *i. e.* in heaven above (the earth) and in earth beneath (the heaven).

BELOW.—“ Pass the time of your sojourning here *below* ;” *i. e.* below (the heaven).

BEFORE.—“ I knew that *before* ;” *i. e.* before (some particular time).

BEHIND.—“ She came in the press *behind* and touched him ;” *i. e.* behind (him).

BESIDES.—“ Besides, it ought to be remembered ;” *i. e.* besides (the circumstance previously mentioned).

BY.—“ He stood *by* while I read ;” *i. e.* by (some person or place).

FOR.—“ Work out your salvation with fear and trembling, *for* it is God who worketh in you, &c. ;” *i. e.* for (this reason).

IN.—“ He went *in* and shut the door ;” *i. e.* in (or into the room).

OVER.—“ He crossed *over* to the other side of the Lake ;” *i. e.* over (the water).

ON.—“ They went *on* till they came,” &c. ; *i. e.* on (their journey).

* In the phrase “ the above list,” the preposition *above* seems to usurp the place of the adjective ; but this is not the case. The above list, means the list above, that is, the list *above that part* of the page where the phrase occurs.

THROUGH.—"They bored the rock *through* ;" i. e. they bored through the rock.

UNDER.—"From two years old and *under* ;" i. e. under (that age).

WITHIN and WITHOUT.—" *Within* were fightings, and *without* were fears ;" i. e. within (us) and without (us).

Many other examples might be given in illustration of the same general position, that (with the exceptions already made) the same word is not more than one part of speech, and that every part of speech has a distinguishing character which it never loses ; but these may perhaps be thought sufficient to point out the manner in which the ellipsis is to be supplied, and the word in question restored to its proper name and unalterable character.

C.

**OUR AUXILIARY VERBS ARE ESSENTIAL PARTS
OF OUR REGULAR VERBS.**

A GREAT deal of unnecessary pains have been taken to show that our auxiliary verbs are not essential to the tenses and moods of our regular verbs, and that the latter have nothing belonging to them but what is indicated by their terminations.

We are told that the English verb has but *one voice*, namely, the active ; *one mood*, the indicative ; and *two tenses*, the present and the past. There is certainly no more than this marked by the verb's terminations ; and on the same principle, it ought to be contended that it has only *one number*, namely, the singular , since the three persons plural are not distinguished by terminations, but only by prefixing the nominative cases of pronouns.

The only terminations which are incorporated with our regular verb are the following :—

dress.....dress-ed.
dress-est.....dress-edst.
dress-es.....dress-ing.

But these, it is evident, would be of very little use without assistance from other quarters. Our regular verbs would be exceedingly “ defective ” verbs, if this were all they could supply. But why restrict them to a few incorporated terminations, when the genius of the language has furnished them with other means of expressing their various modifications and powers ? Every regular verb of every civilized language *must* have voices, moods, tenses, and numbers, whatever be the method in which

these are constructed ; because mankind, whose feelings and passions are every where the same, have uniformly found it necessary to adopt such methods in their intercourse with each other ; and so long as the *time* and *manner* of an action are clearly expressed, it can be of no consequence whether this be done by *one word*, with its incorporated prefixes and terminations, or by a *periphrasis*, or by *both*.

In this respect, the English, French, and Latin verbs differ from each other only in *degree*. The English moods and tenses are composed almost entirely of periphrases ; the French about equally of periphrases and terminations ; and the Latin, almost entirely, but not exclusively, of terminations.

One of the alleged objections to calling a *periphrasis* a *verb* is, that the latter (*verbum*) necessarily implies *one word* only, and that therefore it must be improper to call two or three words by that appellation. But it should be remembered, that the prefixes and terminations of the Greek and Latin verbs were *once* distinct words, though afterwards they *coalesced* with the verb ; and thus, from having been two or three words, became one ;* these prefixes and terminations “ being (as Tooke justly remarks) equally auxiliary with our *uncoalescing* words, and used for the same purpose.” And it is a very conceivable case, that a corresponding change may hereafter take place in the English verb ; that is, that the auxiliaries which at present make up our various moods and tenses, may coalesce with the verb, and with each other, and thus become one word instead of several.

-
- * Thus *amabam* was compounded of *ama-ibam*.
amaveram of *ama-eram*.
amavi of *ama-habui*, *amabui*, *amavi*.
amabo of *ama-volo*, *amavo*, *amabo*.

Viewing the matter in this light, the objection that the verb, on account of its name, ought necessarily to be one word, falls to the ground ; and we are justified in concluding that our auxiliary verbs, are essential to our regular verbs, since the latter, without these, cannot exhibit their several relations ; nor express the various modifications of time, manner, and circumstances of an action, which it is the object of the verbs of all languages *to* express.

D.

ENGLISH NOUNS HAVE NO GENDER.

OUR only methods of marking the difference of sex in animals is by distinguishing names for each ; by the pronouns, *he*, and *she*, and *it* ; and by the pronominal adjectives *his*, *her*, and *its*. Thus much seems to be necessary to prevent confusion.* Yet it cannot be contended that the structure of our language is formed with reference to gender, since our adjectives and participles are unchangeably the same for both sexes, as well as for inanimate objects. We say, "the or that good *man* ;" "the or that good *woman* ;" "the or that good *thing* ;" whereas if our language possessed gender, the adjectives *the*, *that*, and *good* (together with any other adjectives or participles that might be used in connexion with the above nouns), would have terminations varying with the gender of the nouns to which they were annexed.†

To say that males are masculine and females feminine, is only saying that males are males, and females females ; it is a distinction of *fact*, but not a distinction of the *English language*. It does not follow, because the person has a sex, that therefore

* Even this is not uniformly adhered to ; for, 1st, The names *poet*, *author*, *dancer*, *singer*, &c., are applied indiscriminately to males and females. 2d, *He*, *she*, and *it*, are, at this day, used indiscriminately by the common people in various parts of Great Britain ; and, 3d, In our Bible translation, we find "and to every seed *his* own body ;" "but if the salt have lost *his* savour."

† As is the case, for example, with the German adjectives corresponding to the above ; *der*, *die*, *das* ; *jener*, *jene*, *jenes* ; *guter*, *gute*, *gut*.

the noun has a gender. A woman is a female ; but the *noun* woman is no more of the feminine gender than the nouns *ship, moon, England, church, soul*, or any other of the numerous, and often arbitrary, feminine personifications which are in common use. In speaking of these, we say *she* and *her* ; but that, I repeat, does not constitute gender, *unless* the adjectives and participles to which they are annexed, have feminine terminations, which they have not. If the nouns *ship, England, moon*, be without gender (and this is admitted by all modern English grammarians) then must the noun *woman* be equally without gender, since they are all four designated precisely in the same manner.

It may not perhaps be easy for one who knows no language but English, to understand this distinction ; but it is presumed that the Greek, Latin, French, or German scholar will not hesitate to agree to it.

Ben Jonson says, " of genders there are six " ! As the reader perhaps never heard of more than two, or at most three, he may be curious to learn how six can be made out. I will here give them for his information or amusement.

1. *Masculine*, including (B. Jonson says) angels, men, and stars.

2. *Feminine*, including women, islands, countries, and ships.

3. *Neuter*, as houses, stones, and trees.

4. *Promiscuous*, as people, dogs, horses, and cattle.

5. *Doubtful*, as cousin, friend, neighbour.

6. *Common of three genders*. By this he means that adjectives being applied to masculine, feminine, and neuter nouns, may be said to have three genders.

I think these frivolous distinctions will rather serve to confirm than overthrow the doctrine that our nouns have no gender.

E.

ON THE ETYMOLOGY AND USE OF THE WORDS *THEN* AND *THAN*, WHICH ARE SHOWN TO BE THE SAME WORD.—In this Appendix is explained the etymological signification of the comparative degree in English, French, and Latin.

THESE two words, I have no doubt, are one and the same word. They were both written *than* so late as the 17th century, as every reader of old English knows; and they are, I believe, either the infinitive or present participle (it is immaterial which) of the Anglo-Saxon verb *thean*, to assume or suppose; of which verb, as has already been observed, our words *the* and *that*, are the imperative and past participle.

It will be found, on a very slight examination, that the word *then* always signifies that some circumstance previously referred to is *assumed*, supposed, or granted; thus,

“*Then* went out to him all Jerusalem;” i. e. *assuming* (what has already been said concerning John), all Jerusalem went out to him.

“What *then*?” or then, what? i. e. *assuming* (thus much), what follows?

“If Christ be not risen, *then* is our preaching vain;” i. e. if Christ be not risen, then (assuming this) our preaching is vain.

“So *then*, they that are in the flesh cannot please God;” i. e. so then (assuming what has been just advanced) they that are in the flesh cannot please God.

“It (the Church of England) has rescued us first from heathenism; *then* (assuming this) from papal idolatry and superstition. It has saved us fr

temporal and spiritual despotism. We owe to it our moral and intellectual character as a nation ; much of our private happiness, much of our public strength. Whatever should weaken it, would, in the same degree, injure the common weal ; whatever should overthrow it, would, in sure and immediate consequence, bring down the goodly fabric of that constitution, whereof it is a constituent and necessary part. If the friends of the constitution understand this as clearly as its enemies, and act upon it as consistently and actively, *then* (assuming this) will the church and state be safe, and with them, the liberty and prosperity of our country." Concluding words of Southey's Book of the Church.

But our use of *than* in the same sense, is not so evident. I conceive it to be this :—

"You are better *than* I ;" i. e. than I (assuming I am *good*,—the positive degree of the adjective being understood in all such cases) you are better.

"John was greater *than* a prophet ;" i. e. than a prophet (assuming a prophet is *great*) John was greater.

"The judgments of the Lord are more to be desired *than* fine gold ;" i. e. than fine gold (assuming that fine gold is *much* to be desired) the judgments of the Lord are more to be desired.

"It is better to suffer *than* to do wrong." Here the construction would seem to imply that doing wrong is *good*, and that suffering is *better* ; whereas the true meaning is, that "it is *bad* to suffer, but *worse* to do wrong ;" i. e. than to suffer (assuming that to suffer is *bad*) it is worse to do wrong.

We also use *than* after *other* ; thus, "you are to do it for no *other* reason *than* that I command you ;" i. e. than that I command you (assuming that I command you) you are to do it for no other reason.

It seems unaccountable, at first sight, that while
than I, *than* *he*, *than* *we*, we never say, *than*

who; and I am not aware that this seeming anomaly has ever been explained. The above etymology will, however, serve to clear it up, and at the same time, show why we say, *than whom*, instead.

The phrase "you are better than I," or "than he," is evidently to be filled up, *than I am*, or *than he is*; but take the following example:—"Cromwell, *than whom* no man was ever better skilled in artifice;" i. e. *than whom* (assuming *whom*, or *whom* assuming to have been skilled in artifice) no man was ever better skilled. But we cannot say "*who* assuming," since the transitive verb *assume* must govern the objective case of the pronoun. Consequently, *than whom* is right, and *than who* would be wrong.*

We often hear in conversation (particularly, I think, in Scotland) the phrases *than me*, *than him*, *than us*, &c.,† and all our grammarians

* The importance of etymology for determining the true meaning and use of words, will appear from the following extract from "Baker's Remarks on the English Language," concerning the expression *than whom*:—"The late Dr Salter, Master of the Charter House, on seeing the first edition of my book (in which Baker had contended for *than who*), inquired of the bookseller the name of the author, and soon after wrote to me, desiring me to call upon him. When I saw him, he objected to my observation on Pope's expression of *than whom*. He insisted that *than whom* was always right, and that *than who* was a bad expression. I heard what he had to say *without being at all convinced*. But I find that the author of the Introduction of English Grammar (Bishop Lowth), in an edition of his book, published since that time, is of the same opinion, though he seems to own the expression to be ungrammatical. *But neither am I yet convinced, &c.*" Could they have referred to the *derivation* of the word *than*, the dispute would have been at an end.

† Captain M'Intyre, in the Antiquary, says, "there is old Edie, sir, or Caxon, could not they do better *than me*?"

caution us against them as improper, though not one of them attempts to show wherein the impropriety lies ; or how it is that, since *than whom* is correct, *than him* should be incorrect. Now the truth is that the above phrases are not ungrammatical, however unfashionable they may be. Let one example suffice for the whole: "She is better *than him*;" i. e. than him (assuming *him* to be good) she is better. *Than he*, is equally good, but in that case the sentence is to be rendered, "assuming *he is good*."

All this may perhaps seem trifling to those who affect to prefer *things* to *words*. But it ought never to be considered as useless to investigate the origin of what has always been considered as an anomaly in our language ; and to show that it is strictly conformable to the rules of grammar.*

* Let any one read the nonsense which Cobbett has written (Grammar p. 106) on the expression *than whom*, and the confident terms in which he ignorantly condemns it, and it may *then* perhaps be admitted by the most determined anti-etymologist how very necessary it is to know the derivation of a word before venturing to lay down rules for its use. The following is a specimen of Cobbett's reasoning on the expression in question :—"It is a very common parliament-house-phrase, and therefore presumptively corrupt ; but it is a Doctor-Johnson-phrase too." He tells us that we ought to say *than who*, *because* we say *than I*, *than he*, &c. I repeat that the opinion of such a man on grammar would be beneath notice, but for the unaccountable popularity of his book ; and that, not among the persons for whom it was intended, but among the educated classes of society, who ought to have known better than to encourage such trumpery.

Dr A. Murray has a remark on the words *then* and *than*, which affords a fair specimen of his usual habit of substituting random unsupported assertion, in lieu of legitimate derivation :—"One of the earliest applications," he says, "of *thawag* or *tha*, the or that, was to mark time. *Than*

It may not be amiss to add that the French method of constructing the comparative degree, is similar to ours; excepting that they understand not only the positive degree of the adjective, but also the imperative mood of the verb *to assume*; their *que* (qui, quæ, quod,) being *nearly* equivalent to our common acceptance of the word *that*; thus:—

“Le soleil est plus grand *que* la lune;” *i. e.* (assume) *que* la lune (soit grande), le soleil est plus grand.*

“Elle est plus belle *que* quand je la vis;” *i. e.* (assume) *que* quand je la vis (elle fût belle), elle est plus belle.

“Je suis plus fort *que* je n’étais l’année passée;” *i. e.* (assume) *que* je n’étais (fort) l’année passée, je suis plus fort.

“Il dit plus qu’il ne fait;” *i. e.* (assume) qu’il ne fait (beaucoup) il dit plus.

According to these two last solutions, the necessity of the *ne* is apparent, which otherwise seems redundant. The *ne* in French is sometimes redundant, though by no means so often as it appears to be.†

and *thane*, in all the dialects, signified, at that, or at the time; *then*, at that distant time, either past or to come. This word began to be considered as peculiar to that idea, and it gradually assumed a different pronunciation.”

* It is a very common idiom of the French language, to understand an imperative before *que* at the beginning of a sentence; *e. g.*, “— *que* le nom de Dieu soit beni;” “— qu’il te plaise me garder;” “— *que* celui qui a deux vêtemens en donne un à celui qui n’en a point.” The *que*, in such examples, is usually translated *let*; but it is almost needless to remark that there is not the least affinity between *que* and our auxiliary *let*. The true way of rendering these sentences is by understanding the imperative of some verb before *que*, such as, arrange, contrive, or take measures.

† It is redundant in the following sentence:—Je n’a’

The Latin and Greek rule for the comparative degree is analogous to those of the English and French, though to appearance very different; thus,

"*Majora his videbis;*" i. e. *his (existentibus) magnis*—the ablative absolute) *majora videbis*.

"*O fons Blandusiæ splendidior vitro;*" i. e. *vitro (existente splendido)* *fons Blandusiæ splendidior*.

The Greek is of course the same, substituting the genitive for the ablative.*

I cannot conclude this article better than with the following quotation from M. de Brosses, as prefixed to the *Diversions of Purley*: "*Le grand objet de l'art étymologique n'est pas de rendre raison de l'origine de tous les mots sans exception, et j'ose dire que ce seroit un but assez frivole. Cet art est principalement recommandable en ce qu'il fournit à la philosophie des matériaux et des observations POUR ÉLEVER LE GRAND ÉDIFICE DE LA THÉORIE GÉNÉRALE DES LANGUES.*"

nulle raison de vous craindre: but it should be observed that *pas*, *point*, *jamais*, *rien*, and *personne* are not negatives; and hence, whenever these words occur, there is always a real negative expressed or understood. We may remark that in our old authors, Chaucer, Cranmer, G. Douglas, Gower, &c., and even in Shakspeare, the double negative (instead of signifying, as it now does, an affirmative) is frequently employed to give additional force to a single one.

* I have little doubt that the German *als*, than, is *allees*, all-it, our old *all-be-it* (the imperative *be* being understood), which is evidently analogous to the other comparatives we have been considering; thus:—"Er ist mehr gelehrt *als* weise; he is more learned than wise; i. e. *als* weise (all-be-it, or granting he is wise) er ist mehr gelehrt, he is more learned.

F.

ON THE TWOFOLD USE OF THE WORD *THERE*.

We use this word in two ways.

The one has reference to *place*; as "*there* is a man, a house, &c.,"—pointing to the same as visible; or, "*he was there* at the time I was." This use of the word answers to the French *là* and *voilà* (voilà.)

But we have another way of using *there*, which corresponds with the French *il y a*, *il y avoit*, &c., there is, there was, and which, with us, seems to be nothing more than an elegant redundancy: thus,

"*There* was a man sent from God whose name was John;" or, a man was sent from God whose name was John.

"*There* is this to be said;" or, this is to be said.

"Now *there* is a pool at Jerusalem;" or, now a pool is at Jerusalem.

"*There* shall arise false Christs;" or, false Christs shall arise.

"*There* were set *there* six water-pots of stone;" here we have both acceptations of the word, the first being redundant—six water-pots of stone were set there.

It is desirable to know where a word really is redundant, that we may not employ ourselves needlessly in attempting to explain it. Perhaps, however, this apparent redundancy might be accounted for, and the two uses of the word shown to be the same, if we knew its etymology, which we do not know.

There is nothing in Greek or Latin corresponding with this redundant sense of the word *there*; nor does it seem to have been in use among our ancestors; for in Wickliffe's Bible, instead of the sentence "*There* was a man sent from God whose name was

John ;" we find, " a man was sent fro God to whom the name was Jon."

Cobbett, who never finds difficulties in grammar any more than in politics, thus explains the matter in question. His example is, "*There* are many men who have been at Latin schools for years who cannot write six sentences in English." "Now you know (he adds) the word *there*, in its usual sense, has reference to *place*, yet it has no such reference here. The true meaning is that, many men are in *existence* who have been at Latin schools."

As to the *meaning* of the word, we shall never know that accurately till we know its etymology ; but certainly it does not *always* mean "in existence," if ever it do: for, take any of the foregoing examples and try what sense can be made by substituting the expression "in existence," for the word in question ; thus,

"*There* is this to be said ;" i. e. (according to Cobbett) in existence is this to be said ! The simplest solution of the difficulty is to consider the word as redundant—"many men have been at Latin schools for years who cannot write six sentences in English."

G.

ON THE MEANING AND USE OF THE PRONOUN *IT*.

I HAVE never met, in any book, with a clear account of this little word, which yet ought to be given on account of the peculiar manner in which it is commonly used.

To make the matter plain, it will be necessary to advert to the etymology of *IT* ; for I repeat, it is impossible to have a correct idea of any word without knowing its etymology. Tooke has ably shown that *IT* was originally the past participle of a Gothic verb, *hætan*, which meant *to say* ;* consequently, *IT* means “ said.” This accordingly is its exact signification when it *follows* the person or thing alluded to: thus, “ What is that (that thing) you have in your hand? *IT* is an orange;” i. e. *IT* (said thing in my hand) is an orange.

“ Who is there? *IT* is I;” i. e. *IT* (said person who is here) is I.

But *IT* very frequently *goes before* the thing alluded to ; and this is the point which chiefly requires explanation. Many sentences *begin* with *IT*, where this pronoun cannot mean *said*, because nothing *has* yet been said. Take, for example, the following sentence from the Introduction to my Analysis:— “ *IT* will be seen that I have availed myself of some valuable hints suggested by the learned author of the *Diversions of Purley*.” The question is, what noun does the pronoun *IT* here stand for? Evi-

* In Scotland, the aspirate is still preserved among the peasantry: they generally say *hit*.

dently not for any thing *said*, nothing having been previously spoken of or referred to ; but then it will be found, that in all such cases, it relates to something which is *going*, or *about* to be said ; which thing about to be said, is the noun represented by *IT* ; or rather, *IT* is the *anticipation* of this noun, as I shall now proceed to prove.

The following phraseology is common in our language:—"In *his* Essay, *Mr Locke* observes," &c. ; where the pronominal adjective *his* precedes the noun *Mr Locke* to which it refers. *His*, therefore, has, in such instances, an *anticipative reference* to the following noun.

Now the very same thing happens with the pronoun *IT* ; it has often an anticipative reference to the following noun ; so that its exact meaning, in such instances, is not the *said*, but the *about to be said*: thus, in the example already quoted, "*IT* (the about to be said) will be seen (namely) that, I have availed myself of some valuable hints suggested by the learned author of the *Diversions of Purley*."

All similarly-constructed sentences are to be resolved in the same manner ; and so common is this idiom in our language, that there is scarcely a page of an English book that does not contain an example of it, which is an additional reason for giving it a clear explanation. The following are a few more examples:—

"*IT* pleases me to hear that you are so diligent ;" *i. e.* It (the about to be said) pleases me (namely) to hear that you are so diligent.

"*IT* is written, my house shall be called the house of prayer ;" *i. e.* It (the about to be said) is written, (namely) my house shall be called the house of prayer.

"*IT* is easy to conquer our faults when we sincere^{ly} do so ;" *i. e.* It (the about to be said)

is easy, (namely) to conquer our faults when we sincerely wish to do so.

“ We beseech thee to hear us that *IT* may please thee to bless and preserve all the Royal Family ;” *i. e.*—that it (the about to be said) may please thee, (namely) to bless and preserve all the Royal Family.

From this it appears that the pronoun *IT* is never strictly impersonal. It relates either to something going before, or immediately to follow. It serves the office of a *page*, or an *usher*.

In the familiar phrases “ *it* is fair,” “ *it* rains,” “ *it* is dark, light,” &c., “ what o’clock is *it* ?” there is a *tacit* allusion to the state of the atmosphere, or of the weather, or to time. When it is remembered how often the *time* and the *weather* are the subject of our conversation, and how naturally we study *brevity* on familiar topics, we shall cease to wonder that the noun represented by the pronoun *IT*, should not be expressed, but understood only, in all allusions of that kind.

Cobbett has devoted six pages of his Grammar to the pronoun *IT* ; but from his ignorance of the origin and true meaning of the word (which he might have learnt from the *Diversions of Purley*, if he ever heard of such a book), he only gropes in the dark, and misses his object, which yet he is very confident of having attained. “ The pronoun *IT* (he says) though a personal pronoun, does not always stand for, or at least appear to stand for, any noun whatever ; but is used to point out a *state of things*, or the cause of something produced.” It is not very easy to understand what this means ; at least the “ ploughboys and apprentices” will scarcely comprehend it ; but the following example which he gives, may perhaps be thought to throw some light upon his meaning :—“ *IT* is delightful to see brothers and sisters living in uninterrupted love to the end of their days ;” “ that is,” says Cobbett,

“ the state of things which exhibits brothers and sisters living in uninterrupted love, is delightful.” Here is “ delightful” confusion certainly ! A state of things exhibiting persons living in uninterrupted love ! How much more natural is the following solution, and that only because it is the etymological one.—It (the about to be said) is delightful, (namely) to see brothers and sisters living in uninterrupted love.

It would be easy to point out many similar faults in Cobbett’s Grammar. There are even whole pages of discussion, in which we find the utmost confusion of ideas, and palpable grammatical errors, coupled with an appearance of great simplicity of style, and a confident tone in laying down the law, which, with the superficial of this superficial age, pass for perspicuity and accuracy. But I forbear saying more on this subject ; my object being rather to establish truth than confute error.

H.

PROFESSOR DUGALD STEWART AND THE QUARTERLY REVIEW, VERSUS HORNE TOOKE'S DIVERSIONS OF PURLEY.

THE two first have been unwarrantably severe on H. Tooke, on account of his etymological researches, which *they* allege he has employed for purposes at once unphilosophical and preposterous. They accuse him of disregarding the modern signification of words, and restraining them to their primitive and literal use, to the confusion of language, and the subversion of common sense. Their accusations, however, are unsubstantiated, and altogether groundless—except perhaps as to a single incautious remark which Tooke has made on the word *Truth*, which they have most unfairly selected and blazoned forth as a specimen of his whole reasoning.* Tooke was a man of too vigorous and highly

* *Truth, troweth*, that which is *trowed* or affirmed. According to this etymology, “two persons (says Tooke) may contradict one another, and yet both speak truth;” and again, “instead of truth being a rare commodity, there is nothing but truth in the world.” But who would infer from this, that Tooke wished to disregard or invalidate the modern meaning of the word *truth*? And even admitting that he did, are we not still indebted to him for the discovery of this curious etymology of one of the most interesting words of our language? But, after all, the objection to Tooke amounts to nothing; for we often speak of *denying* or *questioning the truth* of an assertion, as we are also said to deny or question *facts*; *i. e.* we question or deny what is *alleged* to be truth or fact until it be proved. Neither truth nor trowing is of any value, unless supported by sufficient evidence.

cultivated an understanding, to maintain that words ought at this day to be understood *only* in the sense they bore when first employed. No man in his senses could support so extravagant an opinion as this, which is contradicted by the changes which almost every word in our language has undergone, and is still undergoing,—changes which Tooke understood better than any man either before his time or since; but he justly thought it would at least be an interesting and instructive “Diversion,” to trace words to their source, and show the connexion between their original and present signification; and he quotes M. de Brosses, Lord Bacon, Bishop Wilkins, and Locke (no contemptible authorities), as strongly recommending such an undertaking, and as anticipating the most useful results from its accomplishment.

“I will venture to say (observes Pinkerton in the preface to his edition of *Ancient Scottish Poems*) that a man who writes a language without acquaintance with its early state, may compose well from chance, but never from intelligence. For knowledge of the primitive and progressive powers of words, is the only solid foundation of that rich and terse style which posterity pronounces classic.”

As to Professor Stewart, he seems to have opposed Tooke for no better reason than that the latter was opposed to his favourite metaphysics. And yet, if a comparison were made between metaphysics (in the modern sense of the word) and etymology, it might easily be proved, that the latter is a far more certain, satisfactory, and useful pursuit than the former. In fact, etymology is the only true metaphysics; for we cannot get at our *thoughts* but through the medium of *words*, which are their signs. We cannot even *think* without the help of words. All the terms by which we express mental or borrowed from sensible objects; and

we cannot have any notion of the mind, or its powers, farther than as we have a knowledge of the true signification of the words by which we express them. Hence, by analyzing our words, we are in fact analyzing our thoughts, and resolving them into their constituent elements.

In short, etymology elucidates the general laws by which the operations of the human mind are regulated, by exhibiting the method she adopts for conveying her ideas ; it lays open the channels in which our words flow when left to the impulse of nature ; and it establishes the interesting fact, that however distantly they may seem to wander from their source, they may always, with care and industry, be traced back to it, and never wholly lose the distinguishing marks of their origin.

“ I have often thought (says Tooke) it was for mankind a lucky mistake, for it was a mistake which Mr Locke made, when he called his book an *Essay on the Human Understanding*. For some part of the inestimable benefit of that work has, merely on account of its title, reached to many thousands more than, I fear, it would have done, had he called it, what it is merely, a *Grammatical Essay*, or a *Treatise on Words and Language*.”

With respect to the too general prejudice against Tooke and his writings, I shall only add, that, as to his religious and political opinions, I dislike them as much as any one ; but that does not shut my eyes to his unrivalled merits as a Philologist, and the incalculable service he has rendered to the English Language.

THE END.

